arXiv:1703.08102v1 [math.OA] 23 Mar 2017

ON THE OUTLYING EIGENVALUES OF A POLYNOMIAL IN LARGE INDEPENDENT RANDOM MATRICES

SERBAN T. BELINSCHI, HARI BERCOVICI, AND MIREILLE CAPITAINE

ABSTRACT. Given a selfadjoint polynomial $P(X,Y)$ in two noncommuting selfadjoint indeterminates, we investigate the asymptotic eigenvalue behavior of the random matrix $P(A_N,B_N)$, where A_N and B_N are independent random matrices and the distribution of B_N is invariant under conjugation by unitary operators. We assume that the empirical eigenvalue distributions of A_N and B_N converge almost surely to deterministic probability measures μ and ν, respectively. In addition, the eigenvalues of A_N and B_N are assumed to converge uniformly almost surely to the support of μ and ν, respectively, except for a fixed finite number of fixed eigenvalues (spikes) of A_N. It is known that the empirical distribution of the eigenvalues of $P(A_N,B_N)$ converges to a certain deterministic probability measure Π_P, and, when there are no spikes, the eigenvalues of $P(A_N,B_N)$ converge uniformly almost surely to the support of Π_P. When spikes are present, we show that the eigenvalues of $P(A_N,B_N)$ still converge uniformly to the support of Π_P, with the possible exception of certain isolated outliers whose location can be determined in terms of μ,ν,P and the spikes of A_N. We establish a similar result when B_N is a Wigner matrix. The relation between outliers and spikes is described using the operator-valued subordination functions of free probability theory. These results extends known facts from the special case in which $P(X,Y)=X+Y$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Suppose given, for each positive integer N, selfadjoint $N\times N$ independent random matrices A_N and B_N, with the following properties:

(a) the distribution of B_N is invariant under conjugation by unitary $N\times N$ matrices;
(b) there exist compactly supported deterministic Borel probability measures μ,ν on $\mathbb{R}$ such that the empirical eigenvalue distributions of A_N and B_N converge almost surely to μ and ν, respectively;
(c) the eigenvalues of A_N and B_N converge uniformly almost surely to the support of μ and ν, respectively, with the exception of a fixed number p of *spikes*, that is, fixed eigenvalues of A_N that lie outside the support of μ.

It was shown in [22] that, under the assumption $p=0$, the eigenvalues of A_N+B_N converge uniformly almost surely to the support of the free additive convolution $\mu\boxplus\nu$. When $p>0$, the eigenvalues of A_N+B_N also converge uniformly almost surely to a compact set $K\subset\mathbb{R}$ such that $K\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\mu\boxplus\nu)$ has no accumulation points in $\mathbb{R}\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\mu\boxplus\nu)$. Moreover, if $t\in K\setminus\operatorname{supp}(\mu\boxplus\nu)$, then $\omega(t)$ is one of the spikes of A_N, where ω is a certain subordination function arising in free probability. The relative position of the eigenvectors corresponding to spikes and outliers is also

HB was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation.

given in terms of subordination functions. We refer to [11] for this result and for a description of earlier work in this area.

The first purpose in this paper is to show that analogous results hold when the sum A_N+B_N is replaced by an arbitrary selfadjoint polynomial $P(A_N, B_N)$. Then, by a comparison procedure to the particular case when B_N is a G.U.E. (Gaussian Unitary Ensemble), we are also able to identify the outliers of an arbitrary selfadjoint polynomial $P(A_N, \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}})$ when X_N is a Wigner matrix. This extends the previous result of [21] which considers additive deformations of Wigner matrices. More precisely we consider an Hermitian matrix $X_N = [X_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^N$, where $[X_{ij}]_{i\geq 1, j\geq 1}$ is an infinite array of random variables such that

(X1) X_{ii}, $\sqrt{2}\Re(X_{ij}), i<j$, $\sqrt{2}\Im(X_{ij}), i<j$, are independent, centered with variance 1,

(X2) there exists a $K>0$ and a random variable Z with finite fourth moment for which there exists $x_0>0$ and an integer $n_0>0$ such that, for any $x>x_0$ and any integer number $n>n_0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{1\leq i,j\leq n}\mathbb{P}\left(|X_{ij}|>x\right)\leq K\mathbb{P}\left(|Z|>x\right).$$

(X3)

$$\sup_{(i<j)\in\mathbb{N}^2}\mathbb{E}(|X_{ij}|^3)<+\infty.$$

Remark 1.1. Note that the previous assumptions (X2) and (X3) obviously hold if X_{ii}, $\sqrt{2}\Re(X_{ij}), i<j$, $\sqrt{2}\Im(X_{ij}), i<j$, are identically distributed with finite fourth moment. When these random variables are standard Gaussian variables, X_N is a so-called G.U.E matrix.

Our result lies in the lineage of recent, and not so recent, works [6, 8, 9, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 25, 26, 30, 32, 34, 38, 39, 40] studying the influence of additive or multiplicative perturbations on the extremal eigenvalues of classical random matrix models, the seminal paper being [8], where the so-called BBP phase transition was observed.

We note that Shlyakhtenko [45] considered a framework which makes it possible to understand this kind of result as a manifestation of infinitesimal freeness. In fact, the results of [45] also allow one to detect the presence of spikes from the behaviour of the bulk of the eigenvalues of $P(A_N, B_N)$, even when $P(A_N, B_N)$ has no outlying eigenvalues. In a related result, Collins, Hasebe and Sakuma [23] study the case in which $\mu=\nu=\delta_0$ and the eigenvalues of A_N and B_N accumulate to given sequences $(\alpha_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ and $(\beta_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ of real numbers converging to zero.

2. Notation and preliminaries on strong asymptotic freeness

We recall that a *C^*-probability space* is a pair $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a C^*-algebra and τ is a state on $\mathcal{A}$. It is often useful to assume that τ is faithful, and we shall do that. The elements of $\mathcal{A}$ are referred to as *random variables*.

If (Ω,Σ,P) is a classical probability space, then $(L^\infty(\Omega),\mathbb{E})$ is a C^*-probability space, where $\mathbb{E}$ is the usual expected value. Given $N\in\mathbb{N}$, $(M_N(\mathbb{C}),\mathrm{tr}_N)$ is a C^*-probability space, where $\mathrm{tr}_N=\frac{1}{N}\mathrm{Tr}_N$ denotes the normalized trace. More generally, if $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$ is an arbitrary C^*-probability space and $N\in\mathbb{N}$, then $M_N(\mathcal{A})=M_N(\mathbb{C})\otimes\mathcal{A}$ becomes a C^*-probability space with the state $\mathrm{tr}_N\otimes\tau$.

The *distribution* μ_a of a selfadjoint element in a C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$ is the compactly supported probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$ uniquely determined by the requirement that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} t^n\,d\mu_a(t)=\tau(a^n)$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$. The *spectrum* of an element $a\in\mathcal{A}$ is

$$\sigma(a)=\{\lambda\in\mathbb{C}\colon \lambda 1-a \text{ non-invertible in } \mathcal{A}\}.$$

For instance, if $A\in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is a selfadjoint matrix, then the distribution of A relative to tr_N is the measure $\mu_A=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\lambda_j(A)}$, where $\sigma(A)=\{\lambda_1(A),\dots,\lambda_N(A)\}$ is the set of eigenvalues of A, repeated according to multiplicity. As usual, the support of a probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$, denoted $\mathrm{supp}(\mu)$, is the smallest closed set $F\subset\mathbb{R}$ with the property that $\mu(F)=1$. It is known that if $a=a^*\in\mathcal{A}$, then

$$\sigma(a)=\mathrm{supp}(\mu_a).$$

Suppose that we are given C^*-probability spaces $\{(\mathcal{A}_N,\tau_N)\}_{N=0}^\infty$ and selfadjoint elements $a_N\in\mathcal{A}_N$, $N\geq 0$. We say that $\{a_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ *converges in distribution* to a_0 if

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\tau_N(a_N^k)=\tau_0(a_0^k),\quad k\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{2.1}$$

We say that $\{a_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ *converges strongly in distribution* to a_0 (or to μ_{a_0}) if, in addition to (2.1), the sequence $\{\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{a_N})\}_{N=1}^\infty$ converges to $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{a_0})$ in the Hausdorff metric. This condition is easily seen to be equivalent to the following assertion: for every $\varepsilon>0$, there exists $N(\varepsilon)\in\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{a_N})\subset\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{a_0})+(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon),\quad N\geq N(\varepsilon).$$

If all the traces τ_N are faithful, this condition can be reformulated as follows:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\|P(a_N)\|=\|P(a_0)\|,$$

for every polynomial P with complex coefficients. This observation allows us to extend the concept of (strong) convergence in distribution to k-tuples of random variables, $k\in\mathbb{N}$. For every $k\in\mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\mathbb{C}\langle X_1,\dots,X_k\rangle$ the algebra of polynomials with complex coefficients in k noncommuting indeterminates $X_1,\dots,X_k$. This is a $*$-algebra with the adjoint operation determined by

$$(\alpha X_{i_1}X_{i_2}\cdots X_{i_n})^*=\overline{\alpha}X_{i_n}\cdots X_{i_2}X_{i_1},\quad \alpha\in\mathbb{C},\ i_1,i_1,\dots,i_n\in\{1,\dots,k\}.$$

Suppose that $\{(\mathcal{A}_N,\tau_N)\}_{N=0}^\infty$ is a sequence of C^*-probability spaces, $k\in\mathbb{N}$, and $\{a_N\}_{N=0}^\infty$ is a sequence of k-tuples $a_N=(a_{N,1},\dots,a_{N,k})\in\mathcal{A}_N^k$ of selfadjoint elements. We say that $\{a_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ *converges in distribution* to a_0 if

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\tau_N(P(a_N))=\tau_0(P(a_0)),\quad P\in\mathbb{C}\langle X_1,\dots,X_k\rangle. \tag{2.2}$$

We say that $\{a_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ *converges strongly in distribution* to a_0 if, in addition to (2.2), we have

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\|P(a_N)\|=\|P(a_0)\|,\quad P\in\mathbb{C}\langle X_1,\dots,X_k\rangle.$$

The above concepts extend to k-tuples $a_N=(a_{N,1},\dots,a_{N,k})\in\mathcal{A}_N^k$ which do not necessarily consist of selfadjoint elements. The only change is that one must use polynomials in the variables $a_{N,j}$ and their adjoints $a_{N,j}^*$, $j=1,\dots,k$.

Remark 2.1. Suppose that all the states τ_N, $N\in\mathbb{N}$, are faithful. It was observed in [22, Proposition 2.1] that $\{a_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ converges strongly in distribution to a_0 if and only if $\{P(a_N)\}_{N=1}^\infty$ converges strongly in distribution to $P(a_0)$ for every selfadjoint polynomial $P\in\mathbb{C}\langle X_1,\dots,X_k\rangle$.

Moreover, strong convergence in distribution also implies the strong convergence at the matricial level. The following result is from [35, Proposition 7.3].

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\{(\mathcal{A}_N, \tau_N)\}_{N=0}^{\infty}$ be C^*-probability spaces with faithful states $\{\tau_N\}_{N=0}^{\infty}$, let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\{a_N\}_{N=0}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of k-tuples of selfadjoint elements $a_N \in \mathcal{A}_N^k$. Suppose that $\{a_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ converges strongly in distribution to a_0. Then $\lim_{N\to\infty} \|P(a_N)\| = \|P(a_0)\|$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every matrix polynomial $P \in M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle)$.*

A special case of strong convergence in distribution arises from the consideration of random matrices in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$. The following result follows from [22, Theorem 1.4] and [12, Theorem 1.2].

Theorem 2.3. *Let $(\mathcal{A}_N, \tau_N)$ denote the space $(M_N(\mathbb{C}), \mathrm{tr}_N)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ are fixed, $u_N = (U_{N,1}, \ldots, U_{N,k_1})$, $x_N = (X_{N,1}, \ldots, X_{N,k_2})$ and $a_N = (A_{N,1}, \ldots, A_{N,k_3})$ are mutually independent random tuples in some classical probability space such that:*

(i) *$U_{N,1}, \ldots, U_{N,k_1}$ are independent unitaries distributed according to the Haar measure on the unitary group $\mathrm{U}(N), N \in \mathbb{N}$.*
(ii) *$X_{N,1}, \ldots, X_{N,k_2}$ are independent Hermitian matrices, each satisfying assumptions $(X1), (X2), (X3)$ defined in the introduction.*
(iii) *a_N is a vector of $N\times N$ selfadjoint matrices such that the sequence $\{a_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ converges strongly almost surely in distribution to some deterministic k_3-tuple in a C^*-probability space.*

Then there exist a C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$, a free family $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_{k_1}) \in \mathcal{A}^{k_1}$ of Haar unitaries, a semicircular system $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_{k_2}) \in \mathcal{A}^{k_2}$ and $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_{k_3}) \in \mathcal{A}^{k_3}$ such that, u, x, and a are free and $\{(u_N, x_N, a_N)\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ converges strongly almost surely in distribution to (u, x, a).

We recall that a tuple $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ of elements in a $\mathcal{C}^*$-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ is a *semicircular system* if $\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ is a free family of selfadjoint random variables and for all $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\tau(x_i^m) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} t^m \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{sc}(t),$$

where

$$\mathrm{d}\mu_{sc}(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sqrt{4 - t^2}\mathbf{1}_{[-2;2]}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \tag{2.3}$$

is the semicircular standard distribution. An element $u \in \mathcal{A}$ is called a *Haar unitary* if $u^* = u^{-1}$ and $\tau(u^n) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. Note that Theorem 1.2 in [12] deals with deterministic a_N but the random case readily follows as pointed out by assertion 2 in [35, Section 3]. The point of Theorem 2.3 is, of course, that the resulting convergence is strong. Earlier results (see [49], [24], [3, Theorem 5.4.5]) exist on convergence in distribution.

We also need a simple coupling result from [22, Lemma 5.1].

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose given selfadjoint matrices $C_N, D_N \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that the sequences $\{C_N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{D_N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ converge strongly in distribution. Then there exist diagonal matrices $\widetilde{C}_N, \widetilde{D}_N \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$, $N \geq 1$, such that $\mu_{\widetilde{C}_N} = \mu_{C_N}$, $\mu_{\widetilde{D}_N} = \mu_{D_N}$, and the sequence $\{(\widetilde{C}_N, \widetilde{D}_N)\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly in distribution.*

3. Description of the models

In order to describe in detail our matrix models, we need two compactly supported probability measures μ and ν on $\mathbb{R}$, a positive integer p, and a sequence of fixed real numbers $\theta_1 \geq \theta_2 \geq \cdots \geq \theta_p$ in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$. The matrix $A_N \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is random selfadjoint for all $N \in \mathbb{N}, N \geq 1$ and satisfies the following conditions:

(A1) almost surely, the sequence $\{A_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ converges in distribution to μ,
(A2) $\theta_1 \geq \theta_2 \geq \cdots \geq \theta_p$ are p eigenvalues of A_N, and
(A3) the other eigenvalues of A_N, which may be random, converge uniformly almost surely to $\mathrm{supp}(\mu)$: almost surely, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $N(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sigma(A_N) \setminus \{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_p\} \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(\mu) + (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \quad N \geq N(\varepsilon).$$

In other words, only the p eigenvalues $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_p$ prevent $\{A_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ from converging strongly in distribution to μ.

We will investigate two polynomial matricial models, both involving A_N.

- Our first model involves a sequence $\{B_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ of random Hermitian matrices such that
  (B1) B_N converges strongly in distribution to the compactly supported probability measure ν on $\mathbb{R}$,
  (B2) for each N, the distribution of B_N is invariant under conjugation by any $N \times N$ unitary matrix.
  We consider the matricial model

$$M_N = P(A_N, B_N) \tag{3.1}$$

  for any selfadjoint polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle$.
- Our second model deals with a $N \times N$ random Hermitian Wigner matrix $X_N = [X_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^N$, $[X_{ij}]_{i\geq 1, j\geq 1}$ is an infinite array of random variables satifying $(X1) - (X3)$ defined in the Introduction. We consider the matricial model

$$M_N = P(A_N, \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}) \tag{3.2}$$

  for any selfadjoint polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle$.

According to results of Voiculescu [49] (see also [54]), there exist selfadjoint elements a, b in a II_1-factor $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ such that, almost surely, the sequence $\{(A_N, B_N)\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ converges in distribution to (a, b). More specifically, a and b are freely independent and $\mu = \mu_a, \nu = \mu_b$. In particular, if P is a selfadjoint polynomial in $\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle$, the sequence $\{P(A_N, B_N)\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ converges in distribution to $P(a, b)$. More precisely,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mu_{P(A_N, B_N)} = \mu_{P(a,b)}$$

almost surely in the weak* topology. When $p = 0$, Lemma 2.4, Theorem 2.3 and Remark 2.1 show that, almost surely, the sequence $\{P(A_N, B_N)\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ converges strongly in distribution to $P(a, b)$ (see the proof of Corollary 2.2 in [22]).

According to (2.10) in [12] and [3, Theorem 5.4.5], if P is a selfadjoint polynomial in $\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle$, then

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mu_{P(A_N, \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}})} = \mu_{P(a,x)}$$

almost surely in the weak* topology, where a and x are freely independent selfadjoint noncommutative random variables, $\mu = \mu_a$, and x is a standard semicircular

variable (i.e $d\mu_x = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sqrt{4-x^2}\,\mathbf{1}_{[-2,2]}(x)$). As in the first model, when $p = 0$, Theorem 2.3 and Remark 2.1 show that, almost surely, the sequence $\{P(A_N, \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}})\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ converges strongly in distribution to $P(a, x)$.

Our main result applies to the case when $p > 0$. Let Y_N be either B_N or $\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}$. The set of outliers of $P(A_N, Y_N)$ is calculated from the spikes $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_p$ using Voiculescu's matrix subordination function [52]. When $Y_N = B_N$, we also show that the eigenvectors associated to these outlying eigenvalues have projections of computable size onto the eigenspaces of A_N. The results are stated in Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.3. In Section 4, we present the necessary tools from operator-valued noncommutative probability theory to present our main results in Section 5.

4. Linearization and subordination

We use two main tools: the analytic theory of operator-valued free additive convolution and the theory of (random and non-random) analytic maps on matrix spaces. For background on freeness, freeness with amalgamation and random matrices we refer to [3, 54, 51, 52]. We briefly describe the necessary terminology and results.

4.1. Operator-valued distributions and freeness with amalgamation.

The concept of freeness with amalgamation and some of the relevant analytic transforms were introduced by Voiculescu in [51]. An important result in this context is the analytic subordination property for free additive convolution of operator-valued distributions [52]. In order to describe it, we need some notation. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital C^*-algebra and $b \in \mathcal{A}$, we denote by $\Re b = (b+b^*)/2$ and $\Im b = (b-b^*)/2i$ the real and imaginary parts of b, so that $b = \Re b + i\Im b$. For a selfadjoint operator $b \in \mathcal{A}$, we write $b \geq 0$ if the spectrum $\sigma(b)$ of b is contained in $[0, +\infty)$ and $b > 0$ if $\sigma(b) \subset (0, +\infty)$. The operator upper half-plane of $\mathcal{A}$ is the set $\mathbb{H}^+(\mathcal{A}) = \{b \in \mathcal{A} \colon \Im b > 0\}$. We denote $\mathbb{H}^+(\mathbb{C})$ by $\mathbb{C}^+$.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra endowed with a normal faithful tracial state τ. If $B \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is a von Neumann subalgebra, then there exists a unique trace- and unit-preserving conditional expectation $E_B \colon \mathcal{M} \to B$ (see [46, Proposition 2.36]). In the following we denote by $B\langle x\rangle$ the von Neumann algebra generated by B and x in $\mathcal{M}$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra endowed with a normal, faithful tracial state τ, let $B \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ be a unital von Neumann subalgebra, let $E \colon \mathcal{M} \to B$ be a trace- and unit-preserving conditional expectation, and let $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ be selfadjoint. Suppose that x and y are free over B. Then there exists an analytic map $\omega \colon \mathbb{H}^+(B) \to \mathbb{H}^+(B)$ such that*

1. *$E_{B\langle x\rangle}\left[(b - (x+y))^{-1}\right] = (\omega(b) - x)^{-1}$, $b \in \mathbb{H}^+(B)$, and*
2. *$\Im\omega(b) \geq \Im b$, for every $b \in \mathbb{H}^+(B)$.*

Maps of the form $b \mapsto E\left[(b - X)^{-1}\right]$ for some selfadjoint X and (conditional) expectation E are also known as *operator-valued Cauchy-Stieltjes transforms*. Assertion (1) is proved in [52]. For (2) see [10, Remark 2.5].

In our applications, the algebra B is $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The following result from [36] explains why this case is relevant in our work.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ be a C^*-probability space, let n be a positive integer, and let $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ be freely independent. Then the map $\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})} \otimes \tau \colon M_n(\mathcal{A}) \to M_n(\mathbb{C})$*

is a unit preserving conditional expectation, and $\beta_1 \otimes x$ *and* $\beta_2 \otimes y$ *are free over* $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ *for any* $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$.

4.2. **Linearization.** As in [4, 13], we use linearization to reduce a problem about a polynomial in freely independent, or asymptotically freely independent, random variables, to a problem about the addition of matrices having these random variables as entries. Then Proposition 4.2 allows us to apply Theorem 4.1 to the algebra $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \subset M_n(\mathcal{A})$ and thereby produce the relevant subordination function. More specifically, suppose that $P \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle$. For our purposes, a *linearization* of P is a linear polynomial of the form

$$z\alpha - L,$$

where

$$L = \beta_0 \otimes 1 + \beta_1 \otimes X_1 + \cdots + \beta_k \otimes X_k,$$

with $\alpha, \beta_0, \ldots, \beta_k \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and the following property is satisfied: *given* $z \in \mathbb{C}$ *and elements* $a_1, \ldots, a_k$ *in a* C^* *algebra* $\mathcal{A}$, $z - P(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ *is invertible in* $\mathcal{A}$ *if and only if* $z\alpha - L(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ *is invertible in* $M_n(\mathcal{A})$. Usually, this is achieved by ensuring that $(z\alpha - L)^{-1}$ exists as an element of $M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle\langle (z-P)^{-1}\rangle)$ and $(z-P)^{-1}$ is one of the entries of the $(z\alpha - L)^{-1}$. It is known (see, for instance, [42]) that every polynomial has a linearization, and linearizations have been used in free probability earlier (see [28]).

We describe in some detail a linearization procedure from [4] (see also [33]) that has several advantages. In this procedure, we always have $\alpha = e_{1,1}$, where $e_{1,1}$ denotes the matrix whose only nonzero entry equals 1 and occurs in the first row and first column. Given $P \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle$, we produce an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a linear polynomial $L \in M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle)$ of the form

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u \\ v & Q \end{bmatrix},$$

such that $u \in M_{1\times(n-1)}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle)$, $v \in M_{(n-1)\times 1}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1 \ldots, X_k\rangle)$, Q is an invertible matrix in $M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots X_k\rangle)$ whose inverse is a polynomial of degree less than or equal to the degree of P, and $uQ^{-1}v = -P$. Moreover, if $P = P^*$, the coefficients of P can be chosen to be selfadjoint matrices in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$.

The construction proceeds by induction on the number of monomials in the given polynomial. We start with a a single monomial $P = X_{i_1}X_{i_2}X_{i_3}\cdots X_{i_{\ell-1}}X_{i_\ell}$, where $\ell \geq 2$ and $i_1, \ldots, i_\ell \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. In this case, we use the polynomial

$$L = -\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & X_{i_1} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & X_{i_2} & -1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \iddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & X_{i_{\ell-1}} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ X_{i_\ell} & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

As noted in [33], the lower right $(\ell-1)\times(\ell-1)$ corner of this matrix is invertible in the algebra $M_{\ell-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle)$ and its inverse has degree $\ell - 2$. (The constant term in this inverse is a selfadjoint matrix and its spectrum is contained in $\{-1, 1\}$.) Suppose now that $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle$ and linear polynomials

$$L_j = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u_j \\ v_j & Q_j \end{bmatrix} \in M_{n_j}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle), \quad j = 1, 2,$$

with the desired properties have been found for P_1 and P_2. Then the matrix

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u_1 & u_2 \\ v_1 & Q_1 & 0 \\ v_2 & 0 & Q_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u \\ v & Q \end{bmatrix} \in M_{n_1+n_2-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \dots X_k\rangle).$$

is a linearization of $P_1 + P_2$ with the same properties. The construction of a linearization is now easily completed for an arbitrary polynomial. Suppose now that P is a selfadjoint polynomial, so $P = P_0 + P_0^*$ for some other polynomial P_0 of the same degree. Let

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & u_0 \\ v_0 & Q_0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

provide a linearization of P_0. Then the selfadjoint linear polynomial

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & u_0 & v_0^* \\ u_0^* & 0 & Q_0^* \\ v_0 & Q_0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u \\ u^* & Q \end{bmatrix}$$

linearizes P. It is easy to verify, following the inductive steps, that this construction produces a matrix Q such that the constant term of Q^{-1} has spectrum contained in $\{1, -1\}$. These properties of Q [33] are useful in our analysis.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that $P \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \dots, X_k\rangle$, and let*

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u \\ v & Q \end{bmatrix} \in M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \dots, X_k\rangle)$$

be a linearization of P with the properties outlined above. Then for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $S_1, \dots, S_k \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\det(ze_{1,1} \otimes I_N - L(S_1, \dots, S_k)) \\ &\qquad = (-1)^{(n-1)N} \det(zI_n - P(S_1, \dots, S_k)) \det Q(S_1, \dots, S_k) \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\dim \ker(zI_n - P(S_1, \dots, S_k)) = \dim \ker(ze_{1,1} \otimes I_N - L(S_1, \dots, S_k)) \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Proof. Suppressing the variables $S_1, \dots, S_k$, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -uQ^{-1} \\ 0 & 1_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z & -u \\ -v & -Q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -Q^{-1}v & 1_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} z - P & 0 \\ 0 & -Q \end{bmatrix}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

(4.1) readily follows. The dimension of the kernel of a square matrix does not change if the matrix is multiplied by some other invertible matrices. Also, since Q is invertible, the kernel of the matrix on the right hand side of the last equality is easily identified with $\ker(z - P)$. The lemma follows from these observations. □

In the case of selfadjoint polynomials, applied to selfadjoint matrices, we can estimate how far $ze_{1,1} - L$ is from being invertible.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that $P = P^* \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \dots, X_k\rangle$, and let*

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u^* \\ u & Q \end{bmatrix} \in M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \dots, X_k\rangle)$$

be a linearization of P with the properties outlined above. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital C^*-algebra and $S = (S_1, \dots, S_k) \in \mathcal{A}^k$ is a k-tuple of selfadjoint elements. Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $z_0 - P(S)$ is invertible. There exist two polynomials

$T_1, T_2 \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle$ with nonnegative coefficients, depending only on L, such that

$$\left\|(z_0 e_{1,1} - L(S))^{-1}\right\| \leq T_1\left(\|S_1\|, \ldots, \|S_k\|\right)\left\|(z_0 - P(S))^{-1}\right\| + T_2\left(\|S_1\|, \ldots, \|S_k\|\right).$$

In particular, if $\operatorname{dist}(z_0, \sigma(P(S))) \geq \delta > 0$ and $\|S_1\| + \cdots + \|S_k\| \leq C$, for some positive constants δ and C, then there exists a constant $\varepsilon > 0$, depending only on L, δ, C such that the distance from 0 to $\sigma(z_0 e_{1,1} - L(S))$ is at least ε.

Proof. For every element a of a C^* algebra, we have $\operatorname{dist}(0, \sigma(a)) \geq 1/\|a^{-1}\|$. Equality is achieved, for instance, if $a = a^*$. A matrix calculation (in which we suppress the variables S) shows that

$$(z_0 e_{1,1} - L)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -Q^{-1}u & 1_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (z_0 - P)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & -Q^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -u^*Q^{-1} \\ 0 & 1_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The lemma follows now because the entries of $u(S)$, $u^*(S)$, and $Q(S)^{-1}$ are polynomials in S, and

$$\|(z_0 - P(S))^{-1}\| = 1/\operatorname{dist}(z_0, \sigma(P(S)))$$

because $P(S)$ is selfadjoint. □

The dependence on L in the above lemma is given via the norms of Q^{-1} and of u. It can clearly be worsened artificially, for example by adding and subtracting MX_1 for some large $M \in \mathbb{R}$. Note also that in general $T_2 \neq 0$: indeed, $\lim_{z\to\infty} \|(ze_{1,1} - L(S))^{-1}\| = \|Q(S)^{-1}\|$.

4.3. **Domain of the subordination function.** Theorem 4.1 informs us that the subordination function ω is defined on all elements with strictly positive imaginary part. In the following, we discuss the behavior of ω on certain subsets of the boundary of its natural domain. Thus, consider a tracial C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ and two selfadjoint random variables $c, d \in \mathcal{A}$ which are free with respect to τ. Let $P = P^* \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle$ and consider a linearization $L = \beta_0 \otimes 1 + \beta_1 \otimes X_1 + \beta_2 \otimes X_1$ of P which satisfies the properties outlined in Section 4.2. In particular, this means that $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2$ are selfadjoint $n \times n$ complex matrices for some $n \geq 1$. According to Proposition 4.2, $\beta_1 \otimes c$ and $\beta_2 \otimes d$ are free over $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ with respect to $\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})} \otimes \tau$. Theorem 4.1 provides a subordination function $\omega\colon \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C})) \to \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$ such that $E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[(w \otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c - \beta_2 \otimes d)^{-1}\right] = (\omega(w) \otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c)^{-1}$ for all $w \in \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$. However, in order to exploit the properties of the subordination function in the context of linearization, we need to prove that is defined on a larger set than $\mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$. In this context, we will encounter meromorphic functions with values in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. By this we mean the obvious thing: if $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is a domain, then a function $f\colon \mathcal{D} \to M_n(\mathbb{C})$ is meromorphic if for any $a \in \mathcal{D}$, there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $z \mapsto (z-a)^n f(z)$ is analytic on a small enough neighbourhood of a.

Lemma 4.5. *The limit $\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) := \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \omega(ze_{1,1} + i\varepsilon 1 - \beta_0)$ exists for any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. The correspondence $z \mapsto \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ is analytic from $\mathbb{C}^+$ to $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, extends meromorphically to $\mathbb{C}\backslash\sigma(P(c,d))$, and the extension satisfies $\omega(\overline{z}e_{1,1} - \beta_0) = \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)^*$. In particular, $z \mapsto \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ is analytic on the complement of a discrete set $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(P(c,d))$, and $\omega(xe_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ is selfadjoint for any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (\sigma(P(c,d)) \cup \mathcal{S})$. Moreover, if w belongs to the connected component of the*

domain of ω that contains $\mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$, then $\omega(w)\otimes 1-\beta_1\otimes c$ is invertible in $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ if and only if $\omega(w)-t\beta_1$ is invertible in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ for all $t\in\sigma(c)$.

The result of the above lemma cannot be generally improved to analytic extension to $\mathbb{C}\setminus\sigma(P(c,d))$. One can find counterexamples even when $P(X_1,X_2)=X_1+X_2$. However, if d is a semicircular random variable, then it follows easily from the results of [29] that ω extends analytically to $\mathbb{C}\setminus\sigma(P(c,d))$.

Given the occurence of meromorphic matrix-valued functions in our lemma, we feel it is justified to use the following convention: if $f\colon\mathcal{D}\to M_n(\mathbb{C})$ is meromorphic and $a\in\mathcal{D}$, then we say that $f(a)$ is invertible if $z\mapsto f(z)^{-1}$ is analytic on a neighbourhood of a. Thus, it may be that a is a pole of f and $\det(f(a)^{-1})=0$. It is in this sense that the last statement of Lemma 4.5 should be understood.

Proof. Recall that $\Im\omega(w)\geq\Im w$ for all $w\in\mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$, so that $\Im\omega(ze_{1,1}+i\varepsilon 1-\beta_0)\geq\Im ze_{1,1}+\varepsilon 1$ for all $\varepsilon>0$. Thus, the family $\{z\mapsto\omega(ze_{1,1}+i\varepsilon 1-\beta_0)\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ is normal on $\mathbb{C}^+$. Let f be a cluster point of this family. It follows from Lemma 4.4 that the correspondence

$$z\mapsto((ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes 1-\beta_1\otimes c-\beta_2\otimes d)^{-1}$$

is analytic on $\mathbb{C}^+$ and thus equal to the limit $\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}((ze_{1,1}+i\varepsilon 1-\beta_0)\otimes 1-\beta_1\otimes c-\beta_2\otimes d)^{-1}$. In particular, $E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[((ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes 1-\beta_1\otimes c-\beta_2\otimes d)^{-1}\right]$ is an $M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)$-valued analytic function of z. We claim that for $|z|>0$ sufficiently large, $E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[((ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes 1-\beta_1\otimes c-\beta_2\otimes d)^{-1}\right]\in M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)$ is invertible. This is equivalent to $zE_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[((ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes 1-\beta_1\otimes c-\beta_2\otimes d)^{-1}\right]$ being invertible for $|z|$ large. If $L=\begin{bmatrix}0&u^*\\u&Q\end{bmatrix}$ is the linearization matrix (meaning in particular that $P=-u^*Q^{-1}u$), then:

$$\begin{aligned}&zE_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[((ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes 1-\beta_1\otimes c-\beta_2\otimes d)^{-1}\right]\\&\quad=\quad E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\begin{bmatrix}z(z-P)^{-1}&-z(z-P)^{-1}u^*Q^{-1}\\-zQ^{-1}u(z-P)^{-1}&zQ^{-1}u(z-P)^{-1}u^*Q^{-1}-zQ^{-1}\end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

As $\lim_{z\to\infty}\|z(z-P)^{-1}-1\|=0$, it follows that $E_{\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle}\left[z(z-P)^{-1}\right]$ is invertible for $|z|$ sufficiently large. The Schur complement formula reduces the invertibility of the above matrix to the invertibility of

$$\begin{aligned}&E_{M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[zQ^{-1}u(z-P)^{-1}u^*Q^{-1}-zQ^{-1}\right]\\&\quad-E_{M_{(n-1)\times 1}(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[zQ^{-1}u(z-P)^{-1}\right]\\&\quad\times E_{\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle}\left[z(z-P)^{-1}\right]^{-1}E_{M_{1\times(n-1)}(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[z(z-P)^{-1}u^*Q^{-1}\right],\end{aligned}$$

which, for $|z|$ sufficiently large, is implied by the invertibility of $E_{M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[Q^{-1}\right]$. However, the construction of L guarantees that there exists an invertible scalar matrix S such that $QS=I_{n-1}-T$, for a nilpotent upper triangular matrix $T\in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1,X_2\rangle)$. Then $(QS)^{-1}=I_{n-1}+T+\cdots+T^{n-1}$, so that

$$S^{-1}E_{M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[Q^{-1}\right]=E_{M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[(QS)^{-1}\right]=I_{n-1}+E_{M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}T^j\right].$$

The element $-H = E_{M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} T^j\right]$ is itself nilpotent upper triangular, so that

$$E_{M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[Q^{-1}\right]^{-1} = \left(I_{n-1} + H + H^2 + \cdots + H^{n-1}\right) S^{-1}.$$

Thus, $E_{M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[Q^{-1}\right]^{-1} \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)$, that is, it is a matrix of polynomials in c, with coefficients which depend on c and d. This guarantees that, for $|z|$ sufficiently large, $E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[((ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)\otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c - \beta_2 \otimes d)^{-1}\right]$ is invertible. But

$$E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[((ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)\otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c - \beta_2 \otimes d)^{-1}\right] = (f(z) - \beta_1 \otimes c)^{-1},$$

which implies that for any cluster point f of $\{z \mapsto \omega(ze_{1,1} + i\varepsilon 1 - \beta_0)\}_{\varepsilon>0}$,

$$f(z) = E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[((ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)\otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c - \beta_2 \otimes d)^{-1}\right]^{-1} + \beta_1 \otimes c$$

for $|z|$ sufficiently large. Now the identity principle for analytic functions guarantees the uniqueness of f, and hence the existence of

$$\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) := \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \omega(ze_{1,1} + i\varepsilon 1 - \beta_0), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

The above argument guarantees the analytic continuation of $z \mapsto \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ to a neighborhood of infinity in the complex plane, and the equality $\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) = E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[((ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)\otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c - \beta_2 \otimes d)^{-1}\right]^{-1} + \beta_1 \otimes c$ shows that $\omega(\overline{z}e_{1,1} - \beta_0) = \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)^*$. As shown in Lemma 4.4, $(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)\otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c - \beta_2 \otimes d$ is invertible if and only if $z \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\sigma(P(c,d))$. Thus, an obstacle to the analytic extension of $\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ to all of $\mathbb{C}\setminus\sigma(P(c,d))$ can only derive from the non-invertibility of $E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[((ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)\otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c - \beta_2 \otimes d)^{-1}\right]$. As seen above, this element can be non-invertible only when $z \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(P(c,d))$. Thus, assume that there is an $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(P(c,d))$ such that $E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[((xe_{1,1} - \beta_0)\otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c - \beta_2 \otimes d)^{-1}\right]$ is not invertible in $M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)$. For any $y > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}&\left[(((x+iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0)\otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c - \beta_2 \otimes d)^{-1}\right] \\ &= \left(\omega((x+iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0)\otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c\right)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}\left[(((x+iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0)\otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c - \beta_2 \otimes d)^{-1}\right]$ is a rational function of c (its coeffcients also depend on $\tau(c^n), n \in \mathbb{N}$). In particular, all its entries belong to the C^*-algebra $C^*(1,c)$ generated by 1 and c. Thus, by norm-continuity (see Lemma 4.4), so do the entries of $E_{M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle c\rangle)}[((xe_{1,1} - \beta_0)\otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes c - \beta_2 \otimes d)^{-1}]$. This implies that each of its entries is identified, via continuous functional calculus, with a continuous function defined on $\sigma(c)$, that is, it belongs to the C^*-algebra of continuous functions from $\sigma(c)$ to $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Denote it by $F_x(t)$, $t \in \sigma(c)$. Its lack of invertibility means that $\det F_x(t_0) = 0$ for some $t_0 \in \sigma(c)$, or, equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \det F_x(t_0) = \lim_{z\to x} \det F_z(t_0) &= \lim_{z\to x} \det\left(\omega((ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - t_0\beta_1\right)^{-1} \\ &= \lim_{z\to x} \frac{1}{\det(\omega((ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - t_0\beta_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

The limits are taken from $\mathbb{C}^+$. Since $\|\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)\| \le u + v|z| + \frac{\vartheta}{\Im z}$ for some constants $u, v, \vartheta \ge 0$ which do not depend on $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ (see, for instance, [11, Section 4]), it follows that $\limsup_{y\to 0} y\|\omega((x+iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0)\| \le \vartheta < \infty$, so that $\limsup_{y\to 0} |y^n \det(\omega(((x+iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0) - t_0\beta_1)| < +\infty$. However, $z \mapsto F_z(t_0)$ is analytic on a neighborhood of x, and then so is $z \mapsto \det F_z(t_0)$, so we conclude that

$\det F_z(t_0)$ has a zero of order at most n at x. Thus, $z \mapsto (z-x)F_z(t_0)^{-1}$ is analytic on a neighborhood of x, and then so is

$$(z-x)\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0) = (z-x)t_0\beta_1 + (z-x)F_z(t_0)^{-1}.$$

We conclude that $\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)$ is meromorphic on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\sigma(P(c,d))$.

Finally, as seen above, an element $\Gamma \in M_n(\mathbb{C})\otimes C^*(1,c)$ is invertible if and only if $\det(\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes\chi_t)(\Gamma)\neq 0$ for all $t\in\sigma(c)$, where χ_t denotes the character defined on $C^*(1,c)$ corresponding to the point $t\in\sigma(c)$. Applying this observation to $\Gamma = \omega(w)\otimes 1 - \beta_1\otimes c$ yields the desired conclusion. □

5. Main results and example

Let $P = P^* \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle$. Choose, as in Section 4.2, a linearization of P of the form $ze_{1,1}-L$, where $L = \beta_0\otimes 1 + \beta_1\otimes X_1 + \beta_2\otimes X_2 \in M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1,X_2\rangle)$. In particular, $\beta_0,\beta_1,\beta_2\in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ are selfadjoint matrices.

Suppose that $\{A_N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{B_N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ are two random sequences of selfadjoint matrices satisfying the hypotheses (A1)–(A3) and (B1)–(B2) of Section 3. As noted above, almost surely the pairs (A_N,B_N) in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ converge in distribution to a pair (a,b) of freely independent selfadjoint random variables in a C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$ such that $\mu_a=\mu$ and $\mu_b=\nu$. By Theorem 4.1, there exists an analytic function $\omega\colon \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))\to\mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}&(\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes\tau)\left[(\omega(w)\otimes 1-\beta_1\otimes a)^{-1}\right]\\ &\quad = \quad (\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes\tau)\left[(w\otimes 1-(\beta_1\otimes a+\beta_2\otimes b))^{-1}\right]\end{aligned}$$

for every $w\in\mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$. As shown in Lemma 4.5, ω extends meromorphically to $(\mathbb{C}\setminus\sigma(P(a,b)))e_{1,1}-\beta_0$. Define the function $\omega_o(z) = (\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)+iI_n)^{-1}$. It follows from Lemma 4.5 and Theorem 4.1(2) that ω_o is analytic on $\mathbb{C}^+$ and has an analytic extension to a neighbourhood of $\mathbb{R}\setminus\sigma(P(a,b))$. Define

$$H_j(z) = \det[(\theta_j\beta_1+i)\omega_o(z) - I_n]$$

and denote by $m_{\theta_j}(t)$ the order of t as a zero of $H_j(z)$ at $z=t$, $1\le j\le p$.

With these notations, we are ready to state our main first result. In the statement, $e_{1,1}$ is viewed as an element of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, and the integer $m(t)$ may take the value zero.

Theorem 5.1. (1) *Suppose that $t\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\sigma(P(a,b))$ and set $m(t)=\sum_{j=1}^p m_{\theta_j}(t)$. Then there exists $\delta_0>0$ such that for any $\delta\in(0,\delta_0)$, almost surely for large N, the random matrix $P(A_N,B_N)$ has $m(t)$ eigenvalues in the interval $(t-\delta,t+\delta)$, counting multiplicity.*

(2) *Assume in addition that the spikes of A_N satisfy $\theta_1>\cdots>\theta_p$, that is, each eigenvalue θ_j has multiplicity one. Assume that $\det H_{i_0}(t)=0$. Then, for ε small enough, almost surely*

(5.1)
$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\left\|E_{A_N}(\{\theta_i\})\left[E_{P(A_N,B_N)}((t-\varepsilon,t+\varepsilon))-\delta_{i,i_0}\mathcal{C}_i(t)I_N\right]E_{A_N}(\{\theta_i\})\right\| = 0,$$

where $\mathcal{C}_i(t) = \lim_{z\to t}(z-t)\left[(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-\theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1}$ is the residue of the analytic function $z\mapsto\left[(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-\theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1}$ at $z=t$.

Remark 5.2. Note that if we know in addition that $z \mapsto \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ is analytic at $z = t$, then the function $H_j(z)$ can be replaced with $z \mapsto \det[\theta_j\beta_1 - \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)]$. Then $m(t)$ is equal to the multiplicity of t as a zero of

$$z \mapsto \prod_{j=1}^{p} \det[\theta_j\beta_1 - \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)].$$

This is always the case when b is a semicircular variable. This case is relevant when B_N is replaced by a Wigner matrix X_N. Under the hypotheses (X1)–(X3) of Section 3, we obtain the following

Theorem 5.3. *Let a, x be free selfadjoint elements in a C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ with distribution μ and μ_{sc} respectively. Let $\omega \colon \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C})) \to \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$ be the $M_n(\mathbb{C})$-valued subordination map* [29, 5] *such that for all $\kappa \in \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$,*

$$\omega(\kappa) = \kappa - \beta_2(\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})} \otimes \tau)\left[(\kappa \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \beta_2 \otimes x - \beta_1 \otimes a)^{-1}\right]\beta_2.$$

Let $t \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\sigma(P(a, x))$. Then, for ϵ small enough, almost surely for large N, there are exactly $\sum_{i=1}^{p}$ multiplicity of t as a zero of $z \mapsto \det(\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i\beta_1)$ eigenvalues of $P(A_N, \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}})$ in an ϵ-neighborhood of t.

Remark 5.4. Suppose that $\mu = \delta_0$. Then the function ω is computed as follows:

$$\omega(w) = \left\{(\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})} \otimes \tau)\left[(w \otimes 1 - \beta_2 \otimes b)^{-1}\right]\right\}^{-1}, \quad w \in M_n(\mathbb{C}).$$

As an illustration, consider the random matrix

$$M = A_N\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}A_N + \frac{X_N^2}{N},$$

where X_N is a standard standard G.U.E. matrix of size N (thus, each entry of X_N has unit norm in $L^2(\Omega)$) and

$$A_N = \mathrm{Diag}(\theta, 0, \ldots, 0), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}.$$

In this case, A_N has rank one, and thus $\mu = \delta_0$. It follows that the limit spectral measure Π of M is the same as the limit spectral measure of $X_N/\sqrt{N}$. Thus, Π is the Marchenko-Pastur distribution with parameter 1:

$$\mathrm{d}\Pi(x) = \frac{\sqrt{(4-x)\,x}}{2\pi x}1_{(0,4)}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

The polynomial P is $P(X_1, X_2) = X_1X_2 + X_2X_1 + X_2^2$, $\mu = \delta_0$ and ν is the standard semi-circular distribution. An economical linearization of P is provided by $L = \beta_0 \otimes 1 + \beta_1 \otimes X_1 + \beta_2 \otimes X_2$, where

$$\beta_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \beta_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \beta_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Denote by

$$G_\Pi(z) = \int_0^4 \frac{1}{z-t}\,\mathrm{d}\Pi(t) = \frac{z + \sqrt{z^2 - 4z}}{2z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, 4]$$

the Cauchy transform of the measure Π. This function satisfies the quadratic equation $zG_\Pi(z)^2 - zG_\Pi(z) + 1 = 0$. Suppose now that $x \notin [0, 4]$. Since $\mu = \delta_0$, we

have $a = 0$. Denoting by $E = \mathrm{Id}_{M_3(\mathbb{C})} \otimes \tau \colon M_3(\mathcal{A}) \to M_3(\mathbb{C})$ the usual expectation and using Remark 5.4, we have

$$\omega(xe_{1,1} - \beta_0) = E\left[(xe_{1,1} - \beta_0 - \beta_2 \otimes b)^{-1}\right]^{-1}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [0,4].$$

The inverse of $(xe_{1,1} - \beta_0) \otimes 1 - \beta_2 \otimes b$ is then calculated explicitly and application of the expected value to its entries yields eventually

$$\omega(xe_{11} - \beta_0) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{G_\Pi(x)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{xG_\Pi(x)} - 1 & \frac{1}{2xG_\Pi(x)} + \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2xG_\Pi(x)} + \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4xG_\Pi(x)} - \frac{1}{4} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The equation $\det[\beta_1\theta - \omega(xe_{11} - \beta_0)] = 0$ is easily seen to reduce to

$$\theta^2 G_\Pi(x)^2 - (1 - G_\Pi(x)) = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

This equation has two solutions, namely

$$\frac{2\theta^4}{-(3\theta^2+1) \pm \sqrt{4\theta^2+1}(\theta^2+1)},$$

one of which is negative. The positive solution belongs to $[4, +\infty)$ precisely when $|\theta| > \sqrt{2}$. Thus, the matrix M_N exhibits one (negative) outlier when $0 < |\theta| \leq \sqrt{2}$ and two outliers (one negative and one > 4) when $|\theta| > \sqrt{2}$. This is illustrated by the simulation presented in Figure 1.

6. Sketch of the proofs

Let us consider the matricial model (3.1). B_N can be written $B_N = U_N D_N U_N^*$ almost surely, where U_N is distributed according to the Haar measure on the unitary group $\mathrm{U}(N)$, D_N is a diagonal matrix, U_N and D_N are independent (see [22, Proposition 6.1]). It is clear that it is sufficient to prove Theorem 5.1 for deterministic A_N and D_N since the random case readily follows as pointed out by assertion 2 in [35, Section 3]. Let $V_N \in \mathrm{U}(N)$ be such that $A_N = V_N \Delta_N V_N^*$ where

$$\Delta_N = \mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_p, \gamma_1(N), \ldots, \gamma_{N-p}(N))$$

is diagonal. Since $P(A_N, B_N) = V_N P(\Delta_N, V_N^* U_N D_N U_N^* V_N) V_N^*$, due to the invariance of the Haar measure, we may assume without loss of generality that A_N is a real diagonal matrix:

$$A_N = \mathrm{Diag}(\lambda_1(A_N), \ldots, \lambda_N(A_N))$$

where $\lambda_j(A_N) = \theta_j, 1 \leq j \leq p$. Hence, in the following we assume that A_N is a real deterministic diagonal matrix and $B_N = U_N D_N U_N^*$, where D_N is a real deterministic diagonal matrix and U_N is distributed according to the Haar measure on the unitary group. The general case readily follows.

After a linearization procedure of P of the form $L \in M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle)$ described in Section 4, the first step of both proofs of Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.3 consists in reducing the problem, in the spirit of [14], to the convergence of an $M_{np}(\mathbb{C})$-valued map F_N, involving a random matrix-valued generalized resolvent. Establishing the convergence of F_N is the main part of the proof. Such a convergence is proved directly for the first model $P(A_N, U_N D_N U_N^*)$ in Section 7 by extending the arguments of [11] and making use of the properties of the operator-valued subordination function described in Section 4. For the second model $P(A_N, \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}})$, the convergence



FIGURE 1. One sample from the model described in Remark 5.4 corresponding to $\theta = 10$, with matrix size $N = 1000$.

of F_N is obtained by a comparison argument to the G.U.E. case in Section 9. The case when X_N is a G.U.E. is a particular case of the unitarily invariant model.

7. Expectations of matrix-valued random analytic maps

7.1. **Conventions and notations.** Fix a selfadjoint polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle$. Choose, as in Section 4.2, a linearization of P of the form $ze_{1,1} - L$, where $L = \beta_0 \otimes 1 + \beta_1 \otimes X_1 + \beta_2 \otimes X_2 \in M_n(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle)$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ are selfadjoint matrices. We fix a classical probability space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$, sufficiently rich so that we may define on it a sequence of random variables U_m, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, distributed according to the Haar measure on the unitary group $\mathrm{U}(m)$ of $m \times m$ matrices. Given an arbitrary set $M \subset M_n(\mathbb{C})$, M' and M'' denote the commutant and the double commutant of M in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. In particular, if $S \subseteq M_m(\mathbb{C})$, then $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes S'' = (I_n \otimes S')'$. The commutator $xy - yx$ of two elements x, y in an algebra is denoted as usual by $[x; y]$.

Pick another integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and Hermitian deterministic matrices $C_N, D_N \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$. We denote

$$R_N(U,w) = \left(w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes C_N + \beta_2 \otimes U D_N U^*)\right)^{-1}, \tag{7.1}$$

defined for all $(U,w) \in \mathrm{U}(N) \times M_n(\mathbb{C})$ such that the expression $w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes C_N + \beta_2 \otimes U D_N U^*)$ is invertible in $M_n(M_N(\mathbb{C}))$. This domain includes $\mathrm{U}(N) \times \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$, as well as $\mathrm{U}(N) \times \{w \in M_n(\mathbb{C})\colon \|w^{-1}\| < (\|\beta_1\|\|C_N\| + \|\beta_2\|\|D_N\|)^{-1}\}$.

7.2. **Properties of the random generalized resolvent.** We focus on the behavior of the random resolvent

$$R_N(U_N,w) = \left(w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes C_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N D_N U_N^*)\right)^{-1},$$

where $U_N \in \mathrm{U}(N)$ is a uniformly distributed random unitary matrix, and $w \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is such that $w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes C_N + \beta_2 \otimes V D_N V^*)$ is invertible for every $V \in \mathrm{U}(N)$. We start with a version of [11, Lemma 4.7].

Lemma 7.1. *Fix $w \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ such that $R_N(U_N,w)$ is defined. Then:*

1. $\mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N,w)\right] \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \{C_N\}''$.
2. *For every $Y \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$,*

$$\left[\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)]; (I_n \otimes Y)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N,w)\left[\beta_1 \otimes C_N; I_n \otimes Y\right] R_N(U_N,w)\right].$$

Proof. Assertion (1) follows from an application of (2) to an arbitrary matrix $Y \in \{C_N\}'$ and from the fact that $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \{C_N\}'' = (I_n \otimes \{C_N\}')'$. To prove (2), observe that the two sides in the identity to be verified are linear in Y, and thus it suffices to consider the case when $Y = Y^*$. The analytic map $H(Y) = \mathbb{E}[(w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes C_N + \beta_2 \otimes e^{iY} U_N D_N U_N^* e^{-iY}))^{-1}]$ is well-defined in an open neighbourhood (in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$) of the set of selfadjoint matrices. The invariance of the Haar measure on $\mathrm{U}(N)$ implies that H is constant on the set of selfadjoint matrices. Since the selfadjoint matrices form a uniqueness set for analytic functions, we conclude that H is constant on an open subset on $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ containing the selfadjoint matrices. This allows us to conclude, for a fixed $Y \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$, that the function $\varepsilon \mapsto \mathbb{E}[(w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes C_N + \beta_2 \otimes e^{\varepsilon Y} U_N D_N U_N^* e^{-\varepsilon Y}))^{-1}]$ is (a) well-defined for $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{C}$ sufficiently small in absolute value, and (b) constant on a sufficiently small disc centered at zero in $\mathbb{C}$. Differentiating with respect to ε at $\varepsilon = 0$ and setting $\varepsilon = 0$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N,w)\left[(I_n \otimes Y); (\beta \otimes U_N D_N U_N^*)\right] R_N(U_N,w)\right] = 0.$$

The equality $R_N(U_N,w)(\beta_2 \otimes U_N D_N U_N^*) = R_N(U_N,w)(w \otimes I_N - \beta_1 \otimes C_N) - I_n \otimes I_N$ applied in the relation above allows us to conclude (2). □

The relation from part (2) of the above lemma is used below in a slightly different, more involved, form, valid when $\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)]$ is invertible in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ (we will see that this is the case when $\Im w > 0$ or when $w = z e_{1,1} - \beta_0$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$):

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[(\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])^{-1} + \beta_1 \otimes C_N; I_n \otimes Y\right] \\ &\quad = (\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[(R_N(U_N,w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)]) \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. (\beta_1 \otimes [Y; C_N])\,(R_N(U_N,w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])\right](\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

This is the equivalent of [11, Relation (4.10)]. The direct algebraic verification of [11, Relation (4.10)] applies without modification to provide (7.2) from Lemma 7.1(2).

From now on, we assume that the sequences of selfadjoint matrices $C_N, D_N \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ are uniformly norm-bounded that is,

$$\sup_{N\in\mathbb{N}}(\|C_N\| + \|D_N\|) < \infty, \tag{7.3}$$

and converge in distribution towards two bounded selfadjoint random variables c, d in a tracial C^*-probability space. We establish a concentration-of-measure result for $R_N(U_N, w)$.

Proposition 7.2. *Let m be fixed in $\mathbb{N}$.*

(1) *Suppose given $P_N, Q_N \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\|P_N\|, \|Q_N\| \leq 1$ and $m = \sup\{\mathrm{rank}(P_N) + \mathrm{rank}(Q_N) \colon N \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Fix $w \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ such that $R_N(\cdot, w)$ is defined on all of $\mathrm{U}(N)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and*

$$\sup\{\|R_N(U, w)\| \colon U \in \mathrm{U}(N), N \in \mathbb{N}\} < +\infty. \tag{7.4}$$

Then:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \|(I_n \otimes Q_N)\,[R_N(U_N, w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)]]\,(I_n \otimes P_N)\| = 0, \tag{7.5}$$

almost surely.

(2) *There exists $c > 0$ depending only on the polynomial P and its linearization L, and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\|(I_n \otimes Q_N)\,[R_N(U_N, w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)]]\,(I_n \otimes P_N)\|^2\right)&\\ \leq \frac{c}{N}\max\{\|R_N(U, w)\|^8 \colon U \in \mathrm{U}(N)\}.&\end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

Proof. We intend to apply the Gromov-Milman concentration result (see [3, Corollary 4.4.28]). Fix an arbitrary $\mathfrak{s} \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C}), \|\mathfrak{s}\| \leq 1$, $\mathrm{rank}(\mathfrak{s}) = 1$. Let $f_{N,\mathfrak{s}} \colon \mathrm{U}(N) \to \mathbb{C}$ be given by $f_{N,\mathfrak{s}}(U) = (\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N)((I_n \otimes Q_N)R_N(U, w)(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathfrak{s}) - (\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N)((I_n \otimes Q_N)\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)](I_n \otimes P_N)\mathfrak{s})$. By using (7.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
&|f_{N,\mathfrak{s}}(U) - f_{N,\mathfrak{s}}(V)|\\
&\quad = |(\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N)((I_n \otimes Q_N)(R_N(U, w) - R_N(V, w))(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathfrak{s})|\\
&\quad = |(\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N)((I_n \otimes Q_N)R_N(U, w)\beta_2 \otimes [(V - U)D_N U^*\\
&\qquad + VD_N(V - U)^*]R_N(V, w)(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathfrak{s})|\\
&\quad \leq |(\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N)((I_n \otimes Q_N)R_N(U, w)\beta_2 \otimes (V - U)D_N U^* R_N(V, w)(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathfrak{s})|\\
&\qquad + |(\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N)((I_n \otimes Q_N)R_N(U, w)\beta_2 \otimes VD_N(V - U)^* R_N(V, w)(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathfrak{s})|\\
&\quad \leq 2(\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N)\,(R_N(V, w)(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathfrak{s}(I_n \otimes Q_N)R_N(U, w)\\
&\qquad \times R_N(U, w)^*(I_n \otimes Q_N^*)\mathfrak{s}^*(I_n \otimes P_N^*)R_N(V, w)^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\qquad \times \|D_N\|\mathrm{Tr}_n(\beta_2^*\beta_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{Tr}_N\left((V_N - U_N)^*(V_N - U_N)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We used in the last inequality the Schwartz-Cauchy inequality for the trace $\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N$, its traciality, and the fact that $axa^* \leq \|x\|aa^*$ for any $x \geq 0$. The first factor in the last product above is estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N)\,(R_N(V, w)(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathfrak{s}(I_n \otimes Q_N)R_N(U, w)\\
&\qquad \times R_N(U, w)^*(I_n \otimes Q_N^*)\mathfrak{s}^*(I_n \otimes P_N^*)R_N(V, w)^*)\\
&\quad \leq \|R_N(V, w)\|^2\|R_N(U, w)\|^2\\
&\qquad \times (\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N)\,((I_n \otimes Q_N^*)\mathfrak{s}^*(I_n \otimes P_N^*)(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathfrak{s}(I_n \otimes Q_N)).
\end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$
\begin{aligned}
(7.7)\quad & |f_{N,\mathfrak{s}}(U) - f_{N,\mathfrak{s}}(V)| \\
&\leq 2(\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N)\left((I_n \otimes Q_N^*)\mathfrak{s}^*(I_n \otimes P_N^*)(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathfrak{s}(I_n \otimes Q_N)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad \times \mathrm{Tr}_n(\beta^*\beta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|D_N\| \|R_N(V,w)\| \|R_N(U,w)\| \, \|U - V\|_{L^2(M_N(\mathbb{C}),\mathrm{Tr}_N)}\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, the function $f_{N,\mathfrak{s}}$ is Lipschitz on the unitary group $\mathrm{U}(N)$. As the rank and the norm of the operator $(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathfrak{s}(I_n \otimes Q_N)$ is uniformly bounded in N, the Lipschitz constant is majorized independently of N.

We intend to estimate the norm $\|(I_n \otimes Q_N)(R_N(U_N,w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])(I_n \otimes P_N)\|$ in terms of $f_{N,\mathfrak{s}}$, which will then allow us to apply [3, Corollary 4.4.28] to it. For any matrix X, we have

$$
\|X\| = \max_{\|\xi\|_2=\|\eta\|_2=1} |\langle X\xi,\eta\rangle| = \max_{\|\xi\|_2=\|\eta\|_2=1} |\mathrm{Tr}(X(\xi\eta^*))| = \max_{\|\mathfrak{s}\|=1,\mathrm{rank}(\mathfrak{s})=1} |\mathrm{Tr}(X\mathfrak{s})|.
$$

We apply this to $\|(I_n \otimes Q_N)(R_N(U_N,w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])(I_n \otimes P_N)\|$, while keeping in mind that U_N is a random variable uniformly distributed over $\mathrm{U}(N)$. Recall the hypothesis that $\mathrm{rank}(I_n \otimes P_N) + \mathrm{rank}(I_n \otimes Q_N) \leq mn$, so that there exist norm-one vectors $h_1,\ldots,h_{mn}$ and $\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_{mn}$ in $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^N$ such that $\mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{h_1,\ldots,h_{mn}\} \supseteq \ker(I_n \otimes P_N)^\perp$ and $\mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_{mn}\} \supseteq \ker(I_n \otimes Q_N^*)^\perp$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|(I_n \otimes Q_N)(R_N(U_N,w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])(I_n \otimes P_N)\| \\
&\quad = \max_{\|\xi\|_2=\|\eta\|_2=1} |\langle (I_n \otimes Q_N)(R_N(U_N,w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])(I_n \otimes P_N)\xi,\eta\rangle| \\
&\quad = \max_{\|\xi\|_2=\|\eta\|_2=1} |\langle (R_N(U_N,w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])(I_n \otimes P_N)\xi,(I_n \otimes Q_N^*)\eta\rangle| \\
&\quad \leq \max_{\|\xi\|_2=\|\eta\|_2=1} \sum_{j,k=1}^{mn} \Big(|\langle \xi,h_j\rangle\langle \ell_k,\eta\rangle| \Big| \langle R_N(U_N,w)(I_n \otimes P_N)h_j,(I_n \otimes Q_N^*)\ell_k\rangle \\
&\qquad\qquad - \langle \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])(I_n \otimes P_N)h_j,(I_n \otimes Q_N^*)\ell_k\rangle \Big| \Big) \\
&\quad \leq m^2n^2 \max_{1\leq j,k\leq mn} |\langle (I_n \otimes Q_N)(R_N(U_N,w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])(I_n \otimes P_N)h_j,\ell_k\rangle| \\
&\quad = m^2n^2 \max_{1\leq j,k\leq mn} |f_{N,\ell_k^* h_j}(U_N)|.
\end{aligned}
$$

(The random complex numbers $\langle \xi,h_j\rangle, \langle \ell_k,\eta\rangle, 1, \leq j,k \leq mn$, which depend on N, are of absolute value at most one.) An application of [3, Corollary 4.4.28] yields the inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\|(I_n \otimes Q_N)(R_N(U_N,w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])(I_n \otimes P_N)\| > \frac{\varepsilon}{N^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}} \right) \\
&\quad \leq 2m^2n^2 \exp\left(-\frac{N^{2\alpha}\varepsilon^2}{8n^4m^4\mathrm{Tr}_n(\beta_2^*\beta_2)\|D_N\|^2 \max_{U\in\mathrm{U}(N)} \|R_N(U,w)\|^4} \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

for any $\alpha \in (0,1/2)$. (7.3) and (7.4) guarantee that the denominator stays bounded.Then (7.5) follows by an application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma.

To prove (7.6), apply the same inequality in the formula $\mathbb{E}[X] = \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(X > t)\,\mathrm{d}t$, which holds for positive random variables X. □

Remark 7.3. The boundedness hypothesis that Proposition 7.2 imposes on R_N is not very restrictive. Indeed, (7.4) is satisfied when

(1) $\Im w > 0$, by $\|(\Im w)^{-1}\|$;

(2) $w = ze_{1,1} - \beta_0$ with $z \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{C}^-$, by an estimate provided by Lemma 4.4;
(3) $w = xe_{1,1} - \beta_0$ with $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $|x| > \sup\{\|P(C_N, UD_NU^*)\| \colon N \in \mathbb{N}, U \in \mathrm{U}(N)\}$, by the same estimate.

Now, let $P_N \colon \mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C}^p$ denote the projection onto the first p coordinates of $\mathbb{C}^N$ in the standard orthonormal basis.

Corollary 7.4. *Almost surely, the sequence of random $M_{np}(\mathbb{C})$-valued functions $z \mapsto (I_n \otimes P_N)\left[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)]\right](I_n \otimes P_N^*)$ converges to zero uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \setminus [-M, M]$ when N goes to infinity. Here $M = \sup\{\|P(C_N, UD_NU^*)\| \colon N \in \mathbb{N}, U \in \mathrm{U}(N)\}$.*

Proof. According to Proposition 7.2 and Remark 7.3(2) and (3), almost surely, for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [-M, M]$ such that $\Im z \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\Re z \in \mathbb{Q}$, the quantity $(I_n \otimes P_N)\left[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)]\right](I_n \otimes P_N^*)$ converges to zero. A second application of Remark 7.3(2) and (3) guarantees that the map $\mathbb{C}\setminus[-M, M] \ni z \mapsto (I_n \otimes P_N)\left[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)]\right](I_n \otimes P_N^*) \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_p(\mathbb{C})$ is uniformly bounded in N on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}\setminus[-M, M]$. The corollary follows. □

Remark 7.5. Under the assumption that C_N is diagonal (in the standard orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{C}^N$), it follows from Lemma 7.1(1) that

$$(I_n \otimes P_N)(\mathbb{E}\left[R(U_N, w)\right])^{-1}(I_n \otimes P_N^*) = \left((I_n \otimes P_N)\mathbb{E}\left[R(U_N, w)\right](I_n \otimes P_N^*)\right)^{-1},$$

the second inverse being considered in $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_p(\mathbb{C})$ - here P_N is the projection onto the first p coordinates of $\mathbb{C}^N$ in the standard orthonormal basis.

Proposition 7.6. *Consider R_N defined in (7.1), $w \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ with $\Im w > 0$, and φ a state on $M_p(\mathbb{C})$. Assume that C_N is a diagonal selfadjoint matrix. Denote $\Omega_N(w) = \beta_1 \otimes C_N + (\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])^{-1}$,*

$$\omega_N(w) = \beta_1 \otimes P_N C_N P_N^* + (I_n \otimes P_N)\left(\mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N, w)\right]\right)^{-1}(I_n \otimes P_N^*),$$

and $\omega_{N,\varphi}(w) = (\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})} \otimes \varphi)(\omega_N(w))$. Then

$$\|\Omega_N(w) - \omega_{N,\varphi}(w) \otimes I_N\| = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right).$$

Proof. Let ψ be an arbitrary pure state on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. We prove that

$$\|(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w) - \omega_{N,\varphi}(w) \otimes I_N)\| = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right),$$

where the norm is the operator norm on $M_N(\mathbb{C})$. Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is constant and ψ arbitrary, this implies the norm convergence claimed by the proposition (recall that any state on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ can be expressed as convex combination of at most n^2 pure states, and the correspondence $\psi \mapsto (\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))$ is norm-continuous on the space of pure states).

It follows from Lemma 7.1(1) that $\Omega_N(w) \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \{C_N\}''$, which in its own turn implies that $(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w)) \in \{C_N\}''$. Applying $(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})$ to (7.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned}(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))Y - Y(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w)) = \\ (\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})\left((\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[(R_N(U_N, w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)]\right)\right. \\ \left.\times\ (\beta_1 \otimes [Y; C_N])(R_N(U_N, w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])\right](\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])^{-1}\big).\end{aligned}$$

An arbitrary pure state on $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is of the form $\phi_h(T) = \langle Th, h\rangle$ for some unit vector $h \in \mathbb{C}^N$. For convenience of notation we will sometimes write it as $\phi_h(T) = h^*Th$. Note that any element $X \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C})$ can be written as $X = \sum_{i,j=1}^n e_{i,j} \otimes X_{ij}$, where $e_{i,j}$ are the standard matrix units in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Thus, $R_N(U_N, w)$ can be written as a sum of tensors in $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C})$ such that the first tensor is always non-random. Assume that Y is a rank-one operator. Combining all these elements together, we conclude the existence of rank n^2 projections p_1, p_2 and rank two projections q_1, q_2 in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|h^*[(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w)); Y]h\right| \\
&\quad = \left|(\psi \otimes \phi_h)\left((\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[(R_N(U_N, w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)]\right)\right.\right. \\
&\qquad \left.\left. \times\ (\beta_1 \otimes [Y; C_N])(R_N(U_N, w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])\right](\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])^{-1}\Big)\right| \\
&\quad = \Big|(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{C}})(\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})} \otimes \phi_h)\left((\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])^{-1}\right. \\
&\qquad \times \mathbb{E}\left[(I_n \otimes p_1)(R_N(U_N, w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])(I_n \otimes q_1)\right. \\
&\qquad \times\ (\beta_1 \otimes [Y; C_N])(I_n \otimes q_2)(R_N(U_N, w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])(I_n \otimes p_2)] \\
&\qquad \left.\times\ (\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])^{-1}\right)\Big| \\
&\quad \leq \left\|(\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])^{-1}\right\|^2 \|\beta_1 \otimes [Y; C_N]\| \\
&\qquad \times \mathbb{E}\left[\|(I_n \otimes p_1)(R_N(U_N, w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])(I_n \otimes q_1)\|^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\qquad \times \mathbb{E}\left[\|(I_n \otimes q_2)(R_N(U_N, w) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, w)])(I_n \otimes p_2)\|^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last relation we have applied the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. We apply relation (7.6) of Proposition 7.2(2) to the projections $p_j, q_j, j = 1, 2$ to the last two factors for a majorization by $(\max\{\|R_N(U, w)\|^8 \colon U \in \mathrm{U}(N)\}c/N)^{1/2}$ per factor. Using the inequality $\|R_N(U, w)\| \leq \|(\Im w)^{-1}\|$, we obtain an upper bound of

$$\frac{c\|\beta_1\|(\|(\Im w)^{-1} + 1\| + \|w\|)^{10}}{N} \sup\{\|C_N\| + 1 \colon N \in \mathbb{N}\} := \frac{K}{N}.$$

Recall that c, and hence K, does not depend on N.

Fix N, $h, k \in \mathbb{C}^N$ of Euclidean norm one, and let Y be the rank-one operator $Y = kh^*$. By the previous estimation and polarization, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{4K}{N} &\geq \left|k^*(Y(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w)) - (\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))Y)h\right| \\
&= \left|k^*k(h^*(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))h) - (k^*(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))k)h^*h\right| \\
&= \left|(h^*(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))h) - (k^*(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))k)\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the hypothesis that the norms of our vectors k, h is one, so that $h^*h = k^*k = 1 \in \mathbb{C}$. Since h^*Th is the generic element of the numerical range of an operator $T \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$, we see that the diameter of the numerical range of $(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))$ is no more than than $\frac{4K}{N}$. Since the operator norm of an operator is at most twice its numerical range, we have obtained that

$$\|(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w)) - zI_N\| \leq \frac{8K}{N},$$

for any complex number z in the numerical range of $(\psi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))$. We use now Voiculescu's asymptotic freeness result [49] together with Theorem 4.1 and

Proposition 4.2 to see that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{N\to\infty} &(\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes \mathrm{tr}_N)(\Omega_N(w)-\beta_1\otimes C_N)^{-1}\\ &= \lim_{N\to\infty}(\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes \mathrm{tr}_N)(\mathbb{E}\,[R_{U_N}(w)])\\ &= (\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes\tau)(w\otimes 1-\beta_1\otimes c-\beta_2\otimes d)^{-1}\\ &= (\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes\tau)(\omega(w)\otimes 1-\beta_1\otimes c)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

(Recall that c, d are free selfadjoint random variables which are the distributional limits of C_N and D_N, respectively, and ω is the $M_n(\mathbb{C})$-valued subordination function of Voiculescu.) We have used here the fact that $\beta_1\otimes c$ and $\beta_2\otimes d$ are free over $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ with respect to the conditional expectation $\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes\tau$, as stated in Proposition 4.2. Since the space of pure states on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ is compact in the norm topology, applying a pure state ψ on the first tensor allows us to conclude that

$$|z-\psi(\omega(w))| = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$$

uniformly in ψ as $N\to\infty$ for w in a compact subset of $\mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$, for all z in the numerical range of $(\psi\otimes\mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))$. In particular, $\|(\psi\otimes\mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))-\psi(\omega(w))I_N\| = O(1/N)$.

We show next that $\|\Omega_N(w)-\omega_{N,\varphi}(w)\otimes I_N\|\to 0$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}&\omega_{N,\varphi}(w)\\ &\quad= (\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes\varphi)(\beta_1\otimes P_NC_NP_N^* + ((I_n\otimes P_N)\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)](I_n\otimes P_N^*))^{-1})\\ &\quad= (\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes\varphi)\left((I_n\otimes P_N)(\beta_1\otimes C_N + (\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)])^{-1})(I_n\otimes P_N^*)\right)\\ &\quad= (\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes\varphi)\left((I_n\otimes P_N)\Omega_N(w)(I_n\otimes P_N^*)\right).\end{aligned}$$

If φ is a state on $M_p(\mathbb{C})$, then $\varphi(P_N\cdot P_N^*)$ is a state on $M_N(\mathbb{C})$. For any pure state ψ on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ we have $\varphi(P_N\cdot P_N^*)\circ(\psi\otimes\mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})}) = \psi\circ(\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes\varphi(P_N\cdot P_N^*)) = \psi\otimes(\varphi(P_N\cdot P_N^*))$. As $\|(\psi\otimes\mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})})(\Omega_N(w))-\psi(\omega(w))I_N\| = O(1/N)$, it follows that for any state ϕ on $M_N(\mathbb{C})$, $|(\psi\otimes\phi)(\Omega_N(w))-\psi(\omega(w))| = O(1/N)$. Applying this to $\phi = \varphi(P_N\cdot P_N^*)$, we obtain that

$$(\psi\otimes\varphi(P_N\cdot P_N^*))(\Omega_N(w)) = \psi(\omega_{N,\varphi}(w))\to\psi(\omega(w))$$

as $N\to\infty$, at a speed of order $1/N$. Since this holds uniformly over the (compact) set of pure states ψ on $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, the statement of our Proposition follows. □

As a consequence of the above proof, we also note that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\omega_{N,\varphi}(w) = \omega(w), \tag{7.8}$$

for any state φ on $M_p(\mathbb{C})$ and $w\in M_n(\mathbb{C})$, $\Im w>0$. We also deduce the following corollary (by using Remark 7.5) that will be used in Section 9.

Corollary 7.7. *Asumme that C_N is diagonal and that $P_NC_NP_N^* = sI_p$ for some $s\in\mathbb{R}$. Then, for any $w\in M_n(\mathbb{C})$, $\Im w>0$, $(I_n\otimes P_N)\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N,w)](I_n\otimes P_N^*)$ converges towards $(\omega(w)-\beta_1 s)^{-1}\otimes I_p$.*

The approximation results of Proposition 7.6 are needed also for $w = ze_{1,1}-\beta_0$, $z\in\mathbb{C}^+$. The following lemma accounts for this case.

Lemma 7.8. *With the notations of Proposition* 7.6*, the limit*

$$\Omega_N(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) := \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \Omega_N(ze_{1,1} + i\varepsilon I_n - \beta_0)$$

exists for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$*. The correspondence* $z \mapsto \Omega_N(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ *is analytic on* $\mathbb{C}^+$*, it extends to a neighborhood of infinity in* $\mathbb{C}$*, and satisfies* $\Omega_N(\overline{z}e_{1,1} - \beta_0) = \Omega_N(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)^*$*. Moreover,*

$$\|\Omega_N(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \omega_{N,\varphi}(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) \otimes I_N\| = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$$

for any state φ *on* $M_n(\mathbb{C})$*.*

Proof. We prove first that $\mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)\right]$ is invertible in $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C})$ for $|z|$ sufficiently large. The method is similar to the one employed in the proof of Lemma 4.5. Recall that $L = \beta_0 \otimes 1 + \beta_1 \otimes X_1 + \beta_2 \otimes X_2$ is a linearization of the selfadjoint polynomial $P(X_1, X_2) \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle$ obtained via the method described in Section 4.2. We evaluate L in $X_1 = C_N, X_2 = UD_NU^*$ for an arbitrary $U \in \mathrm{U}(N)$:

$$ze_{1,1} \otimes I_N - L = \begin{bmatrix} zI_N & u(C_N, UD_NU^*)^* \\ u(C_N, UD_NU^*) & Q(C_N, UD_NU^*) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $u(C_N, UD_NU^*) \in M_{(n-1)\times 1}(M_N(\mathbb{C}))$ and $Q(C_N, UD_NU^*) \in M_{n-1}(M_N(\mathbb{C}))$. In the following we suppres the matrix arguments of u and Q. According to Lemma 4.4, this matrix is invertible for any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. We recall from the proof of Lemma 4.5 that Q^{-1} is of the form $Q^{-1} = S(I_{n-1} + T + \cdots + T^{n-1})$, where $S \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$ is orthogonal and $T \in M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle)$ is upper triangular and nilpotent. Thus, $T(C_N, UD_NU^*) \in M_{n-1}(M_N(\mathbb{C}))$ is also an $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ nilpotent upper triangular matrix with entries from $M_N(\mathbb{C})$, for all $U \in \mathrm{U}(N)$. Taking expectation with respect to the Haar measure on $\mathrm{U}(N)$ does not change the structure of $T(C_N, UD_NU^*)$.

As in the proof of Lemma 4.5, composing $R_N(\cdot, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ with the Haar-distributed random variable U_N and taking expectation entrywise provides in the lower right $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ corner

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Q^{-1}u(z - P)^{-1}u^*Q^{-1}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[Q^{-1}\right],$$

where we have suppressed the arguments C_N and $U_ND_NU_N^*$ from u, P, and Q. For $|z|$ large, the first term is very small in norm, so that invertibility of $\mathbb{E}\left[Q^{-1}\right]$ implies invertibility for the whole expression. But this follows easily from the fact (noted above) that $\mathbb{E}\left[Q(C_N, U_ND_NU_N^*)^{-1}\right] = (S \otimes I_N)(I_{n-1} \otimes I_N + \mathbb{E}[T(C_N, U_ND_NU_N^*) + \cdots + T(C_N, U_ND_NU_N^*)^{n-1}])$ and $\mathbb{E}[T(C_N, U_ND_NU_N^*) + \cdots + T(C_N, U_ND_NU_N^*)^{n-1}]$ is itself upper triangular nilpotent. Thus, $\mathbb{E}\left[Q^{-1}\right]$ is invertible in $M_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C})$. As in Lemma 4.5, we conclude the invertibility of $\mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)\right]$ for $|z|$ sufficiently large. Thus, for such values $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} + i\varepsilon - \beta_0)\right]^{-1} = \mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)\right]^{-1},$$

as a limit of analytic functions. Since

$$\Im\mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} + i\varepsilon - \beta_0)\right]^{-1} > 0$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the family $\{z \mapsto \mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} + i\varepsilon - \beta_0)\right]^{-1}\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ is normal. This implies that $\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} + i\varepsilon - \beta_0)\right]^{-1} = \mathbb{E}\left[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)\right]^{-1}$ exists and is analytic for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. The other statements of the lemma follow easily. □

We note for future reference the analogue of (7.8) on $\mathbb{C}^+e_{1,1} - \beta_0$:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \omega_{N,\varphi}(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) = \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0), \tag{7.9}$$

for any state φ on $M_p(\mathbb{C})$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$.

Proposition 7.9. *Let $P_N \colon \mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C}^p$ be the projection on the first p coordinates of $\mathbb{C}^N$ in the standard orthonormal basis. Assume that $C_N, D_N \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ are selfadjoint matrices, diagonal in the standard orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{C}^N$, each of which converges strongly, to the bounded selfadjoint random variables c and d, respectively. Assume that c and d are free with respect to the tracial state τ. Let $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(P(c,d))$ be given. Then almost surely as $N \to \infty$, the random analytic function $z \mapsto R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ extends analytically to a neighbourhood of x. Furthermore, assume that $c_i := \lim_{N\to\infty}(C_N)_{i,i}$ exist for $1 \le i \le p$. Let $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(P(c,d))$ be given. Then almost surely*

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{N\to\infty} (I_n \otimes P_N) R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)(I_n \otimes P_N^*) \\ &= \left(\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) \otimes I_p - \beta_1 \otimes \operatorname{diag}(c_1, \ldots, c_p)\right)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

in the norm topology.

Observe that, as shown in Lemma 4.5, $z \mapsto \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ is meromorphic, not analytic, on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(P(c,d))$.

Proof. Theorem 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 state that $\{C_N, U_N D_N U_N^*\}$ converge strongly to the free pair $\{c, d\}$ as $N \to \infty$. According to Remark 2.1, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, almost surely for all large N, the eigenvalues of $P(C_N, UD_NU^*)$ are within an ε-neighborhood of $\sigma(P(c,d))$. That is, with the notations introduced in Section 7.1, there exists a set $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon \subset \Omega$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon) = 1$ and for any $\varpi \in \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon$, there exists an $N_\varpi \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sigma(P(C_N, U_N(\varpi)D_N U_N(\varpi)^*)) \subseteq \sigma(P(c,d)) + (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ whenever $N \ge N_\varpi$. If $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ are sufficiently small so that $(x-\delta, x+\delta) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus (\sigma(P(c,d)) + (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon))$, then $R_N(U_N(\varpi), ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ extends analytically to $\mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{C}^- \cup (x-\delta, x+\delta)$.

However, according to Corollary 7.4, there exists a probability one set $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ such that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \|(I_n \otimes P_N)[R_N(U_N(\varpi), ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)]](I_n \otimes P_N^*)\| = 0, \tag{7.11}$$

for all $\varpi \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ and all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. The set $\mathcal{O} := \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon \cap \tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ has probability one.

Recall that $\omega_N(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) = \beta_1 \otimes P_N C_N P_N^* + (I_n \otimes P_N)(\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)])^{-1}(I_n \otimes P_N^*)$, so that, by Remark 7.5,

$$(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)](I_n \otimes P_N^*) = \left(\omega_N(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \beta_1 \otimes P_N C_N P_N^*\right)^{-1},$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Choose the pure states $\varphi_j = e_j^* \cdot e_j$, $1 \leq j \leq p$, corresponding to the standard orthonormal basis $\{e_1, \ldots, e_p\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^p$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})} \otimes \varphi_j)\left((I_n \otimes P_N)(\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)])^{-1}(I_n \otimes P_N)^*\right) \\
&\quad = \quad (\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})} \otimes \varphi_j)\left(\omega_N(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \beta_1 \otimes P_N C_N P_N^*\right) \\
&\quad = \quad \omega_{N,\varphi_j}(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - (C_N)_{j,j}\beta_1,
\end{aligned}$$

for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(I_n \otimes P_N)\mathbb{E}[R_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)](I_n \otimes P_N^*) \\
&\quad = \quad \left[\sum_{j=1}^{p} (\omega_{N,\varphi_j}(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - (C_N)_{j,j}\beta_1) \otimes e_{j,j}\right]^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 7.8 (see equation(7.9)) and equation (7.11) that for all $\varpi \in \mathcal{O}$, we have for any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{N\to\infty} (I_n \otimes P_N)R_N(U_N(\varpi), ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)(I_n \otimes P_N^*) \\
&\quad = \quad \lim_{N\to\infty} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{p} (\omega_{N,\varphi_j}(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - (C_N)_{j,j}\beta_1) \otimes e_{j,j}\right]^{-1} \\
&\quad = \quad (\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) \otimes I_p - \beta_1 \otimes \mathrm{diag}(c_1, \ldots, c_p))^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

As shown in Lemma 4.5, $z \mapsto \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ is meromorphic on $\mathbb{C}^+ \cup (x-\delta, x+\delta) \cup \mathbb{C}^-$, and $\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) \otimes I_p - \beta_1 \otimes \mathrm{diag}(c_1, \ldots, c_p)$ is invertible on the same domain. By Lemma 4.4, $z \mapsto (I_n \otimes P_N)R_N(U_N(\varpi), ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)(I_n \otimes P_N^*)$ is unifomly bounded in N on any compact set in $\mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{C}^- \cup (x - \delta, x + \delta)$. Thus, by Montel's Theorem, if $\varpi \in \mathcal{O}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{N\to\infty} (I_n \otimes P_N)R_N(U_N(\varpi), ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)(I_n \otimes P_N^*) \\
&\quad = \quad (\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) \otimes I_p - \beta_1 \otimes \mathrm{diag}(c_1, \ldots, c_p))^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{C}^- \cup (x - \delta, x + \delta)$. □

8. Proof of Theorem 5.1

We are now ready to prove Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. As explained in Section 6, due to the invariance of the Haar measure, we may assume without loss of generality that $B_N = U_N D_N U_N^*$ where U_N is distributed according to the Haar measure on the unitary group and both A_N and D_N are real diagonal matrices in the standard basis of $\mathbb{C}^N$, such that

$$A_N = \mathrm{Diag}(\lambda_1(A_N), \ldots, \lambda_N(A_N)), \quad D_N = \mathrm{Diag}(\lambda_1(B_N), \ldots, \lambda_N(B_N)),$$

where $\lambda_j(A_N) = \theta_j, 1 \leq j \leq p$. Then A_N and $U_N D_N U_N^*$ converge in distribution to a pair a, b of bounded free selfadjoint random variables in a tracial C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$, and μ (resp. ν) is the distribution of a (resp. b) with respect to τ.

As in [11], we write A_N as a sum $A_N = A'_N + A''_N$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
A'_N &= \mathrm{Diag}(s, \ldots, s, \lambda_{p+1}(A_N), \ldots, \lambda_N(A_N)), \\
A''_N &= \mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1 - s, \ldots, \theta_p - s, 0, \ldots, 0).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the real number s is an arbitrary point in $\mathrm{supp}(\mu)$. Define the matrix

$$\Theta = \mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1 - s, \ldots, \theta_p - s) = P_N A''_N P_N^*,$$

so that $A''_N = P_N^* \Theta P_N$ where P_N is the canonical projection $\mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C}^p$ acting as the identity on the first p coordinates of the standard basis of $\mathbb{C}^N$. With this choice of s, A'_N and D_N converge strongly to a and b, respectively, and thus, according to Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 2.4, $\{A'_N, U_N D_N U_N^*\}$ converges strongly to the free pair $\{a, b\}$. Thus, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, almost surely for all large N, the spectrum of $P(A'_N, U_N D_N U_N^*)$ is included in $\{x \in \mathbb{R}, d(x, \sigma(P(a,b))) \leq \varepsilon\}$. Recall the linearization $L(A_N, U_N^* D_N U_N) = \beta_0 \otimes I_N + \beta_1 \otimes A_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N$ of the polynomial P evaluated in the matrices A_N and $U_N^* D_N U_N$ described in Section 4.2. According to Lemma 4.3, a real number x is an eigenvalue of $P(A_N, U_N^* D_N U_N)$ if and only if the matrix $(xe_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \beta_1 \otimes A_N - \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N$ is not invertible. Moreover, according to (4.1), the dimension of the kernel of $xI_N - P(A_N, U_N^* D_N U_N)$ is equal to the multiplicity of the zero of $z \mapsto \det[ze_{1,1} \otimes I_N - L(A_N, U_N^* D_N U_N)]$ at x. We write

$$\begin{aligned} & w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N) \\ &= \; w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A''_N + \beta_1 \otimes A'_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N) \\ &= \; \left[I_n \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes P_N^* \Theta P_N)(w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A'_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N))^{-1}\right] \\ &\quad \times (w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A'_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N)) \end{aligned}$$

This relation holds for any $w \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ such that $w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A'_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N)$ is invertible. In particular, according to Lemma 4.3, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, almost surely for large N, the relation holds for $w = ze_{1,1} - \beta_0$, for any z outside an ε-neighborhood of $\sigma(P(a,b))$. Thus, almost surely for large N, for any z outside an ε-neighborhood of $\sigma(P(a,b))$, $(ze_{11} - \beta_0) \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N)$ is invertible if and only if $\left[I_n \otimes I_N - \beta_1 \otimes P_N^* \Theta P_N ((ze_{11} - \beta_0) \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A'_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N))^{-1}\right]$ is invertible. The invertibility of this expression is in its own turn equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \det\left[I_n \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes P_N^* \Theta P_N)\right. \\ & \qquad \left. \times \; ((ze_{11} - \beta_0) \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A'_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N))^{-1}\right] \neq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{8.1}$$

According to Sylvester, $\det[I_r - XY] = \det[I_s - YX]$ if $X \in M_{r \times s}(\mathbb{C})$ and $Y \in M_{s \times r}(\mathbb{C})$. Thus, relation (8.1) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \det\left[I_n \otimes I_p - (\beta_1 \otimes \Theta)(I_n \otimes P_N)\right. \\ & \qquad \left. \times \; ((ze_{11} - \beta_0) \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A'_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N))^{-1} (I_n \otimes P_N^*)\right] \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we assume $w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A'_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N)$ to be invertible, the invertibility of $w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A_N + \beta_2 \otimes U_N^* D_N U_N)$ is equivalent to that of $I_n \otimes I_p - (\beta_1 \otimes \Theta) F_N(U_N, w)$, where

$$F_N(U, w) = (I_n \otimes P_N)(w \otimes I_N - (\beta_1 \otimes A'_N + \beta_2 \otimes U^* D_N U))^{-1} (I_n \otimes P_N^*).$$

We recognize $F_N(U_N, w) = (I_n \otimes P_N) R_N(U_N, w) (I_n \otimes P_N^*)$ where R_N is defined in (7.1) with C_N replaced by A'_N. Recall that $(A'_N)_{j,j} = s \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ for $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. An application of Proposition 7.9 yields that, for all z in the complement of $\sigma(P(a,b))$, almost surely,

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \| F_N(U_N, ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - ((\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - s\beta_1) \otimes I_p)^{-1} \| = 0$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{N\to\infty} &\det\big\{(\beta_1\otimes\Theta)(I_n\otimes P_N)[(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes I_N-(\beta_1\otimes A'_N+\beta_2\otimes U_N^*D_NU_N)]^{-1}\\ &\quad\times(I_n\otimes P_N^*)-I_n\otimes I_p\big\}\\ =\ &\lim_{N\to\infty}\det[(\beta_1\otimes\Theta)F_N(U_N,ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-I_n\otimes I_p]\\ =\ &\det[(\beta_1\otimes\Theta)((\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p)-I_n\otimes I_p]\\ =\ &\det[\beta_1(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes\Theta-I_n\otimes I_p].\end{aligned}$$

As the determinant is multilinear, $z\mapsto\det[\beta_1(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes\Theta-I_n\otimes I_p]$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\sigma(P(a,b))$. For any ϖ in some event Ω with probability one, there exists $N_0(\varpi)>0$, such that for any $N\geq N_0(\varpi)$, the function

$$z\mapsto\det[(\beta_1\otimes\Theta)F_N(U_N(\varpi),ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-I_n\otimes I_p]$$

is well defined on $\mathbb{C}\setminus(\sigma(P(a,b))+(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon))$ and

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{N\to\infty}\det[(\beta_1\otimes\Theta)F_N(U_N(\varpi),ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-I_n\otimes I_p]\\ &\qquad=\ \det[\beta_1(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes\Theta-I_n\otimes I_p]\end{aligned}\tag{8.2}$$

for all z in the countable dense subset $[\mathbb{C}\setminus(\sigma(P(a,b))+(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon))]\cap(\mathbb{Q}+i\mathbb{Q})$ of $\mathbb{C}\setminus(\sigma(P(a,b))+(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon))$. Moreover, according to Lemma 4.4, the family

$$\{z\mapsto\det[(\beta_1\otimes\Theta)F_N(U_N(\varpi),ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-I_n\otimes I_p]\}_{N\geq N_0(\varpi)}$$

is uniformly bounded in $N\geq N_0(\varpi)$ on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}\setminus(\sigma(P(a,b))+(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon))$. Therefore, by Vitali's theorem, we conclude that, for any ϖ in Ω, the limit (8.2) holds uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}\setminus(\sigma(P(a,b))+(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon))$. It follows by Hurwitz's Theorem (see [41, Kapitel 8.5]) that almost surely, if $t\in\mathbb{R}\setminus(\sigma(P(a,b))+(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon))$ is a zero of $z\mapsto\det[\beta_1(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes\Theta-I_n\otimes I_p]$ of multiplicity $m(t)$, then for any $0<\delta<\delta_t$ there exists $N_\delta\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $z\mapsto\det[(\beta_1\otimes\Theta)F_N(U_N(\varpi),ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-I_n\otimes I_p]$ has $m(t)$ zeros (counted with multiplicity) in $(t-\delta,t+\delta)$ for $N\geq N_\delta$ and conversely, if $\det[\beta_1(\omega(te_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes\Theta-I_n\otimes I_p]\neq 0$, then for any $0<\delta<\delta_t$ there exists $N_\delta\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $\det[(\beta_1\otimes\Theta)F_N(U_N(\varpi),xe_{1,1}-\beta_0)-I_n\otimes I_p]\neq 0$ for all $x\in(t-\delta,t+\delta)$. This gives a characterization of the eigenvalues of $P(A_N,U_N^*D_NU_N)$ which are almost surely outside $\sigma(P(a,b))$ in terms of Voiculescu's subordination function and the spikes of A_N. We still need to argue that this characterization is equivalent to the one described in part (1) of Theorem 5.1. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}&\beta_1(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes\Theta-I_n\otimes I_p\\ &\quad=\ (\beta_1\otimes\mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1,\dots,\theta_p)-s\beta_1\otimes I_p)\,(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p-I_n\otimes I_p\\ &\quad=\ (\beta_1\otimes\mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1,\dots,\theta_p)-\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes I_p)\,(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p.\end{aligned}$$

If $z\mapsto\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)$ is analytic at $z=t$, then $\det[\beta_1(\omega(te_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes\Theta-I_n\otimes I_p]=0$ if and only if $\det[\beta_1\otimes\mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1,\dots,\theta_p)-\omega(te_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes I_p]=0$, and the zero has the same order. This is the determinant of a block-diagonal $p\times p$ matrix having on the diagonal the $n\times n$ selfadjoint matrices $\theta_j\beta_1-\omega(te_{1,1}-\beta_0)$. Thus,

$$0=\det[\beta_1(\omega(te_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes\Theta-I_n\otimes I_p]=\prod_{j=1}^{n}\det[\theta_j\beta_1-\omega(te_{1,1}-\beta_0)],$$

as stated in Remark 5.2.

Unfortunately, the map $z \mapsto \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$, while analytic on $\mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{C}^-$, is guaranteed by Lemma 4.5 to be only meromorphic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(P(a,b))$. A pole of $z \mapsto \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ might produce another zero for the determinant $\det[\beta_1(\omega(te_{1,1} - \beta_0) - s\beta_1)^{-1} \otimes \Theta - I_n \otimes I_p]$, which does not come from the above product. In order to avoid that, we have introduced the auxiliary function $\omega_o(z) = (\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) + iI_n)^{-1}$. This function is analytic in a complex neighborhood of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(P(a,b))$, as well as on all of $\mathbb{C}^+$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\beta_1(\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - s\beta_1)^{-1} \otimes \Theta - I_n \otimes I_p \\ &\quad = \quad [\beta_1\omega_o(z) \otimes \Theta - (I_n - (iI_n + s\beta_1)\omega_o(z)) \otimes I_p]\,(I_n - (iI_n + s\beta_1)\omega_o(z))^{-1} \otimes I_p.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $I_n - (iI_n + s\beta_1)\omega_o(x)$ is an invertible matrix for all $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(P(a,b))$. Indeed, if $\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ is analytic around x, then, according to Lemma 4.5, it is selfadjoint. Thus, as $I_n - (iI_n + s\beta_1)\omega_o(x) = I_n + (s\beta_1 + iI_n)(\omega(xe_{1,1} - \beta_0) - s\beta_1)^{-1} = (s\beta_1 + iI_n)[(s\beta_1 + iI_n)^{-1} + (\omega(xe_{1,1} - \beta_0) - s\beta_1)^{-1}]$, the invertibility of $I_n - (iI_n + s\beta_1)\omega_o(x)$ is equivalent to the invertibility of $[(s\beta_1 + iI_n)^{-1} + (\omega(xe_{1,1} - \beta_0) - s\beta_1)^{-1}]$. But this last expression has imaginary part strictly less than zero, so it is invertible. If $\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ is not analytic, but only meromorphic, around x, by Lemma 4.5, $z \mapsto (\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - s\beta_1)^{-1}$ is still analytic around x, and thus necessarily selfadjoint in x, so that the same argument shows the invertibility of $[(s\beta_1 + iI_n)^{-1} + (\omega(xe_{1,1} - \beta_0) - s\beta_1)^{-1}]$. Thus, the second factor on the right-hand side of the above-displayed relation satisfies $\det[(I_n - (iI_n + s\beta_1)\omega_o(x))^{-1} \otimes I_p] \neq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(P(a,b))$. So $\det[\beta_1(\omega(xe_{1,1} - \beta_0) - s\beta_1)^{-1} \otimes \Theta - I_n \otimes I_p] = 0$ if and only if $\det[\beta_1\omega_o(x) \otimes \Theta - (I_n - (iI_n + s\beta_1)\omega_o(x)) \otimes I_p] = 0$. But $\beta_1\omega_o(z) \otimes \Theta - (I_n - (iI_n + s\beta_1)\omega_o(z)) \otimes I_p$ is again a $p \times p$ block-diagonal matrix with blocks of size $n \times n$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\det[\beta_1\omega_o(z) \otimes \Theta - (I_n - (iI_n + s\beta_1)\omega_o(z)) \otimes I_p] \\ &\quad = \quad \det\begin{bmatrix}(\theta_1\beta_1 + i)\omega_o(z) - I_n & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & (\theta_p\beta_1 + i)\omega_o(z) - I_n\end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, given $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(P(a,b))$, $\det[\beta_1(\omega(te_{1,1} - \beta_0) - s\beta_1)^{-1} \otimes \Theta - I_n \otimes I_p] = 0$ if and only if

$$\prod_{j=1}^{p} \det[(\theta_j\beta_1 + i)\omega_o(t) - I_n] = 0.$$

Moreover, the order of the zero of $\det[\beta_1(\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - s\beta_1)^{-1} \otimes \Theta - I_n \otimes I_p] = 0$ at $z = t$ is equal to the sum of the orders of the zeros of the factors $\det[\theta_j\beta_1 + i)\omega_o(z) - I_n]$ at $z = t$, $j = 1, \ldots, p$. This proves part (1) of our theorem.

We discuss next the asymptotic position of the eigenvectors corresponding to outliers relative to the position of the eigenvectors of A_N. Given a normal operator X on a Hilbert space, we denote by E_X its spectral measure. Thus, if S is a Borel set in $\mathbb{C}$, and $X \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$, then $E_X(S)$ is the orthogonal projection onto the linear span of all eigenvectors of X corresponding to eigenvalues in S. Assume that $\theta_1 > \cdots > \theta_p$. Then $E_{A_N}(\{\theta_i\})$ is a rank one projection, and thus the Hermitian matrices in these equations have rank one, so their norm is equal to the absolute value of their unnormalized trace. Thus we need to show that, almost surely,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathrm{Tr}_N\left[E_{A_N}(\{\theta_i\})E_{P(A_N, U_N D_N U_N^*)}((t-\varepsilon, t+\varepsilon))\right] = \delta_{i,i_0}\mathcal{C}_i(t). \tag{8.3}$$

Choose $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small and N large enough so that $[\theta_i - \delta, \theta_i + \delta] \cap \sigma(A_N) = \{\theta_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq p$. If $\mathcal{S}$ is an open subset of a finite-dimensional Euclidean space, denote by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S})$ the space of complex-valued compactly supported smooth functions on $\mathcal{S}$. Pick functions $f_i \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $0 \leq f_i(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $f_i(\theta_i) = 1$ and $\mathrm{supp}(f_i) \subseteq [\theta_i - \delta, \theta_i + \delta]$. Choose also a function $h \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $0 \leq h(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathrm{supp}(h) \subseteq (t - \varepsilon, t + \varepsilon)$, and $h(x) = 1$ for all $x \in [t - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}]$. It follows form part (1) of our theorem that for N sufficiently large, we have

$$E_{A_N}(\{\theta_i\}) E_{P(A_N, U_N D_N U_N^*)}((t - \varepsilon, t + \varepsilon)) = f_i(A_N) h(P(A_N, U_N D_N U_N^*))$$

almost surely (here, and in the following, the evaluation of a function on a normal operator is understood in the sense of continuous functional calculus).

Next we need a concentration of measure result similar to the one in Proposition 7.2. Define $g_{N,i} \colon \mathrm{U}(N) \to \mathbb{C}$ by $g_{N,i}(U) = \mathrm{Tr}_N\left[f_i(A_N) h(P(A_N, U D_N U^*))\right]$. We show that $g_{N,i}$ is Lipschitz with a Lipschitz constant that is majorized independently of N.

Lemma 8.1. *Suppose given a function $h \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$ and a selfadjoint polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, X_2\rangle$. Assume that the selfadjoint matrices $A_N, D_N \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ satisfy $M := \sup\{\|A_N\| + \|D_N\| \colon N \in \mathbb{N}\} < +\infty$. Then the functions $g_{N,i} \colon \mathrm{U}(N) \to \mathbb{C}$ $g_{N,i}(U) = \mathrm{Tr}_N[f_i(A_N) h(P(A_N, U D_N U^*))]$ are Lipschitz, with Lipschitz constants γ_N which satisfy the boundedness condition $C := \sup\{\gamma_N \colon N \in \mathbb{N}\} < +\infty$.*

Proof. Assume first that P is a single monomial: $P(X_1, X_2) = X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_m}$. Then $P(A_N, U D_N U^*)$ can be written as

$$P(A_N, U D_N U^*) = K_0 U D_N U^* K_1 U D_N U^* \cdots K_{r-1} U D_N U^* K_r,$$

where $K_j \in \{1, A_N, \ldots, A_N^m\}$ and $r \in \{0, 1, \ldots, m+1\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &P(A_N, U D_N U^*) - P(A_N, V D_N V^*) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{r} K_0 U D_N U^* \cdots K_{j-1} \left[U D_N (U - V)^* + (U - V) D_N V^*\right] K_j \cdots V D_N V^* K_r, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|P(A_N, U D_N U^*) - P(A_N, V D_N V^*)\|_2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{r} \|K_0\| \|D_N\| \cdots \|K_{j-1}\| \left[\|D_N\| \|U - V\|_2 + \|U - V\|_2 \|D_N\|\right] \\ &\qquad \times \|K_j\| \cdots \|D_N\| \|K_r\| \\ &\leq 2(m+1) \sup\{1, \|A_N\|, \|D_N\|\}^m \|U - V\|_2 < 2(m+1)(M+1)^m \|U - V\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let now

$$P(X_1, X_2) = a_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_j = 1}^{2} a_{i_1, \ldots, i_j} X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_j}, \quad a_0, a_{i_1, \ldots, i_j} \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\|P(A_N, U D_N U^*) - P(A_N, V D_N V^*)\|_2 \\ &< \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_j = 1}^{2} |a_{i_1, \ldots, i_j}| 2(j+1)(M+1)^j \right) \|U - V\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

and the constant $\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_j=1}^{2}|a_{i_1,\ldots,i_j}|2(j+1)(M+1)^j\right)$ does not depend on N. Recall that if $h\colon \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{C}$ is Lipschitz, then so is its functional calculus $h\colon \{X\in M_N(\mathbb{C})\colon X=X^*\}\to M_N(\mathbb{C})$, with the same Lipschitz constant when $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is endowed with the Hilbert-Schmidt norm (see, for instance, [17, Lemma A.2]). Since $h\in\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$, it follows that h is Lipschitz; denote its Lipschitz constant by γ. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|g_{N,i}(U)-g_{N,i}(V)|\\
&\quad= |\mathrm{Tr}_N\left[f_i(A_N)\left(h(P(A_N,UD_NU^*))-h(P(A_N,VD_NV^*))\right)\right]\\
&\quad\le \|f_i(A_N)\|_2\|h(P(A_N,UD_NU^*))-h(P(A_N,VD_NV^*))\|_2\\
&\quad\le \gamma\|P(A_N,UD_NU^*)-P(A_N,VD_NV^*)\|_2\\
&\quad< \gamma\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_j=1}^{2}|a_{i_1,\ldots,i_j}|2(j+1)(M+1)^j\right)\|U-V\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

According to [3, Corollary 4.4.28], we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|g_{N,i}(U_N)-\mathbb{E}[g_{N,i}(U_N)]|>\eta\right)\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{\eta^2N}{4C^2}\right),\quad \eta>0.$$

By the Borel-Cantelli lemma,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\left(g_{N,i}(U_N)-\mathbb{E}[g_{N,i}(U_N)]\right)=0,\quad 1\le i\le p, \tag{8.4}$$

almost surely. According to [17, Lemma 6.3],

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[g_{N,i}(U_N)]=\\
&\quad-\lim_{y\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{\pi}\Im\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{Tr}_N\left[f_i(A_N)\left((\xi+iy)I_N-P(A_N,U_ND_NU_N^*)\right)^{-1}\right]\right]h(\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\xi=\\
&\quad-\lim_{y\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{\pi}\Im\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left[\left((\xi+iy)I_N-P(A_N,U_ND_NU_N^*)\right)^{-1}\right]_{i,i}\right]h(\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\xi
\end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

as $f_i(A_N)$ is simply the projection onto the i^{th} coordinate. Recall the linearization L of P:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left((\xi+iy)I_N-P(A_N,U_ND_NU_N^*)\right)^{-1}\\
&\quad=\left[\left((\xi+iy)(e_{1,1}\otimes I_N)-L(A_N,U_ND_NU_N^*)\right)^{-1}\right]_{1,1},
\end{aligned}$$

where the entry $(1,1)$ is an $N\times N$ matrix entry of the $n\times n$ linearization matrix (see Section 4.2). By Proposition 7.9 and Proposition 7.2(1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{N\to\infty}(I_n\otimes P_N)\mathbb{E}\left[\left((\xi+iy)(e_{1,1}\otimes I_N)-L(A_N,U_ND_NU_N^*)\right)^{-1}\right](I_n\otimes P_N)^*\\
&\quad=\left(\omega((\xi+iy)e_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes I_p-\beta_1\otimes\mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1,\ldots,\theta_p)\right)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\left[\left[\left((\xi+iy)I_N-P(A_N,U_ND_NU_N^*)\right)^{-1}\right]_{i,i}\right]\\
&\quad=\left[\left(\omega((\xi+iy)e_{1,1}-\beta_0)-\theta_i\beta_1\right)^{-1}\right]_{1,1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.6}$$

We would like to be able to pass to the limit as $N \to \infty$ in (8.5) and replace the expectation of the resolvent under the integral with the expression involving the subordination function. Denote by

$$\Delta_{i,N}(z) = \left[(\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1} - \mathbb{E}\left[\left[(zI_N - P(A_N, U_N D_N U_N^*))^{-1}\right]_{i,i}\right].$$

According to Lemma 4.5, this function is well-defined on $\mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{C}^-$ and satisfies $\Delta_{i,N}(\overline{z}) = \overline{\Delta_{i,N}(z)}$. We claim that there exists a sequence $\{v_N\}_N \in [0, +\infty)$ such that $\lim_{N\to\infty} v_N = 0$ and

$$|\Delta_{i,N}(z)| < v_N\left(1 + \frac{1}{(\Im z)^2}\right), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+. \tag{8.7}$$

Indeed, observe first that $z \mapsto \mathbb{E}\left[\left[(zI_N - P(A_N, U_N D_N U_N^*))^{-1}\right]_{i,i}\right]$ is the Cauchy-Stieltjes transform of a probability measure $\vartheta_{N,i}$. The hypotheses of our matrix model guarantee that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \|P(A_N, U_N D_N U_N^*)^m\| < \infty$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, so that the family $\{\vartheta_{N,i}\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight, and moreover, all its limit points have moments of all order. As seen in (8.6) though, the sequence of Cauchy-Stieltjes transforms on $\vartheta_{N,i}$ has a limit as $N \to \infty$, namely $z \mapsto \left[(\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1}$. Moreover, according to Lemma 4.5, $z \mapsto \left[(\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1}$ extends analyticaly with real values to $\mathbb{R} \setminus [-\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{m}]$ for $\mathfrak{m} > 0$ sufficiently large, so that $\vartheta_i = \lim_{N\to\infty} \vartheta_{N,i}$ has compact support. Thus, $\Delta_{i,N}(z)$ is the difference of two Cauchy-Stieltjes transforms of compactly supported probability measures, one converging to the other. We apply [11, Lemma 4.1] with $\rho_N = \vartheta_{N,i} - \vartheta_i$ to conclude.

Relations (8.7), (8.5), and the Lemma from [19, Appendix] allow us to write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[g_{N,i}(U_N)] \\
&= -\lim_{N\to\infty}\lim_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi}\Im \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left[((\xi + iy)I_N - P(A_N, U_N D_N U_N^*))^{-1}\right]_{i,i}\right] h(\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\xi \\
&= \lim_{N\to\infty}\lim_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi}\Im \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Delta_{i,N}(\xi + iy) h(\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\xi \\
&\quad - \lim_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi}\Im \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(\omega((\xi + iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1} h(\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\xi \\
&= -\lim_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi}\Im \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(\omega((\xi + iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1} h(\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\xi. \qquad (8.8)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\operatorname{supp}(h) \subseteq (t-\varepsilon, t+\varepsilon)$ and $h(x) = 1$ for $x \in [t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}]$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi} \Im \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(\omega((\xi+iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i \beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1} h(\xi)\, \mathrm{d}\xi \\
&= \lim_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{t-\varepsilon}^{t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \Im \left[(\omega((\xi+iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i \beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1} h(\xi)\, \mathrm{d}\xi \\
&\quad + \lim_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{t+\varepsilon} \Im \left[(\omega((\xi+iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i \beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1} h(\xi)\, \mathrm{d}\xi \\
&\quad - \lim_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \Im \left[(\omega((\xi+iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i \beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1} \mathrm{d}\xi \\
&= \lim_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \left[(\omega((\xi+iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i \beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1} \mathrm{d}\xi \\
&\quad - \lim_{y\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \left[(\omega((\xi-iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i \beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1} \mathrm{d}\xi.
\end{aligned}$$

We have used the fact that $z \mapsto (\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}$ is analytic on $[t-\varepsilon, t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}] \cup [t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, t+\varepsilon]$ and takes selfadjoint values, and the fact that $\omega(\overline{z}e_{1,1} - \beta_0) = \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)^*$. Recall (see, for instance, [1, Chapter 4]) that if f is an analytic function on a simply connected domain D, except for an isolated singularity a, then $\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_\gamma f(z)\,\mathrm{d}z = n(\gamma, a)\mathrm{Res}_{z=a} f(z)$. Here γ is a closed Jordan path in D not containing a, $n(\gamma, a)$ is the winding number of γ with respect to a, and $\mathrm{Res}_{z=a} f(z)$ is that number R which satisfies the condition that $f(z) - \frac{R}{z-a}$ has vanishing period (called the residue of f at a). Let γ_y be the simple path formed by concatenating the segments $[t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - iy, t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2} + iy]$, $[t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2} + iy, t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2} + iy]$, $[t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2} + iyt+\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - iy]$ and $[t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - iy, t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2} - iy]$, with winding number one with respect to t. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Res}_{z=t} \left[(\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i \beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1} \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_y} \left[(\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i \beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1} \mathrm{d}z \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \left[(\omega((\xi+iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i \beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1} \mathrm{d}\xi \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \left[(\omega((\xi-iy)e_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i \beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1} \mathrm{d}\xi \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}-iy}^{t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}+iy} + \int_{t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}-iy}^{t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}-iy} \right) \left[(\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i \beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1} \mathrm{d}z,
\end{aligned}$$

independent of $y > 0$. Thus, we may take limit as $y \searrow 0$ in the above. As $z \mapsto \left[(\omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0) - \theta_i\beta_1)^{-1} \right]_{1,1}$ is analytic on a neighborhood of γ_y for all $y > 0$,

it follows that the last two integrals tend to zero as y decreases to zero. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Res}_{z=t}\left[(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-\theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1}\\
&= \lim_{y\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}\left[(\omega((\xi+iy)e_{1,1}-\beta_0)-\theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1}\mathrm{d}\xi\\
&\quad -\lim_{y\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{t-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}\left[(\omega((\xi-iy)e_{1,1}-\beta_0)-\theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1}\mathrm{d}\xi\\
&= -\lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}[g_{N,i}(U_N)].
\end{aligned}$$

Since $z\mapsto -\left[(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-\theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1}$ preserves half-planes, if it has t as an isolated singularity on $\mathbb{R}$ for it, then t must be a simple pole of it. Thus, the function

$$-\lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}[g_{N,i}(U_N)]=\lim_{z\to t}(z-t)\left[(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-\theta_i\beta_1)^{-1}\right]_{1,1}.$$

Combining this with (8.8), (8.6), (8.4) and (8.3), we conclude the proof of part (2) of Theorem 5.1. □

9. Proof of Theorem 5.3

Unlike the case of the unitary model discussed until now, the map ω is holomorphic, not just meromorphic, on the set $\{\kappa\in M_n(\mathbb{C})\colon \kappa\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}-\beta_2\otimes x-\beta_1\otimes a \text{ invertible}\}$. This justifies the comment from Remark 5.2.

It is clear that it is sufficient to prove Theorem 5.3 for deterministic A_N since the random case readily follows as pointed out by assertion 2 in [35, Section 3]. We provide a self-contained proof for the convenience of the reader interested exclusively in the Wigner case.

9.1. **Reduction to the convergence of an $M_{np}(\mathbb{C})$-valued map.** This section follows almost verbatim the first part of Section 8. Let V_N be a $N\times N$ unitary matrix such that $A=V_ND_NV_N^*$ where

$$D_N=\mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1,\dots,\theta_p,\gamma_1(N),\dots,\gamma_{N-p}(N)).$$

We split A_N into a sum of two matrices $A_N=A'_N+A''_N$, where

$$A'_N=V_N\mathrm{Diag}(s,\dots,s,\gamma_1(N),\dots,\gamma_{N-p}(N))V_N^*=V_ND'_NV_N^*,$$

$$A''_N=V_N\mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1-s,\dots,\theta_p-s,0,\dots,0)V_N^*=V_ND''_NV_N^*.$$

Here $s\in\mathbb{R}$ is a constant belonging to the support of μ. The strenghtened asymptotic freeness result [12, Theorem 2.1] and [22, Proposition 2.1] guarantee that the support of $\hat{\mu}_{P(A'_N,\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}})}$ converges almost surely to $\sigma(P(a,x))$ as $N\to\infty$. Therefore, using Lemma 4.3, for all $z_0\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\sigma(P(a,x))$, for all $0<\epsilon<d(z_0,\sigma(P(a,x)))$, almost surely for N large enough, for all $z\in\mathbb{C}$ such that $|z-z_0|<\epsilon$, $(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A'_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}$ is invertible. Define the matrix

$$\Theta=\mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1-s,\dots,\theta_p-s)=P_ND''_NP_N^*,$$

so that $D''_N=P_N^*\Theta P_N$ where P_N is the canonical orthogonal projection $\mathbb{C}^N\to\mathbb{C}^p$ onto the first p coordinates of $\mathbb{C}^N$. For any z in $(z_0-\epsilon;z_0+\epsilon)$, set $w=ze_{1,1}-\beta_0$.

We write

$$\begin{aligned} & w\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}} \\ &= \quad w\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A''_N-\beta_1\otimes A'_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}} \\ &= \quad \left[I_n\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes V_NP_N^*\Theta P_NV_N^*\left(w\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A'_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^{-1}\right] \\ &\quad \times\left(w\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A'_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the invertibility of $(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}$ is equivalent to the invertibility of $\left[I_n\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes V_NP_N^*\Theta P_NV_N^*\left(w\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A'_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^{-1}\right]$, which is in its own turn equivalent to

$$\det\left[I_n\otimes I_N-(\beta_1\otimes V_NP_N^*\Theta P_NV_N^*)\left(w\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A'_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^{-1}\right]\neq 0.$$

Note that, by (4.1), the multiplicity of an eigenvalue z of $P(A_N,\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}})$ in $(z_0-\epsilon,z_0+\epsilon)$ coincides with the multiplicity of z as a zero of

$$\det\left[I_n\otimes I_N-(\beta_1\otimes V_NP_N^*\Theta P_NV_N^*)\left(w\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A'_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^{-1}\right].$$

As $\det[I_r-XY]=\det[I_s-YX]$ for rectangular matrices $X\in M_{r\times s}(\mathbb{C})$ and $Y\in M_{s\times r}(\mathbb{C})$, it follows that the zeros in $(z_0-\epsilon,z_0+\epsilon)$ of $\det(zI_N-P(A_N,\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}})$ and of

$$\begin{aligned} &\det\big[I_n\otimes I_p- \\ &\qquad (\beta_1\otimes\Theta)(I_n\otimes P_NV_N^*)\left(w\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A'_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^{-1}(I_n\otimes V_NP_N^*)\Big] \end{aligned}$$

coincide (with multiplicity). Thus, our problem reduces to the study of the limiting behavior of the function

$$F_N(w)=(I_n\otimes P_NV_N^*)\left(w\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A'_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^{-1}(I_n\otimes V_NP_N^*)\in M_{np}(\mathbb{C}).$$

9.2. **The Gaussian case.** Let $\mathcal{G}_N$ be a standard G.U.E (Gaussian Unitary Ensemble) $N\times N$ matrix and set $F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)=(I_n\otimes P_NV_N^*)(w\otimes I_N-\beta_1\otimes A'_N-\beta_2\otimes\frac{\mathcal{G}_N}{\sqrt{N}}))^{-1}(I_n\otimes V_NP_N^*)$.

Proposition 9.1. *Let $\omega\colon\mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))\to\mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$ be the $M_n(\mathbb{C})$-valued subordination map* [29, 5] *such that for all $\kappa\in\mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$,*

$$\omega(\kappa)=\kappa-\beta_2(\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}\otimes\tau)\left[(\kappa\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}-\beta_2\otimes x-\beta_1\otimes a)^{-1}\right]\beta_2.$$

For any $w\in\mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$, $\mathbb{E}\left[F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)\right]$ converges towards $((\omega(w)-s\beta_1)\otimes I_p)^{-1}$, when N goes to infinity.

Proof. Let w be in $\mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$. First note that, by the unitarily invariance of the distribution of the G.U.E matrix, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[(I_n \otimes P_N)(w \otimes I_N - \beta_1 \otimes D'_N - \beta_2 \otimes \frac{\mathcal{G}_N}{\sqrt{N}})^{-1}(I_n \otimes P_N^*)\right].$$

For any $K > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)] = \mathbb{E}[F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)\mathbf{1}_{\|\mathcal{G}_N\| \leq K}] + \mathbb{E}[F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)\mathbf{1}_{\|\mathcal{G}_N\| > K}].$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and choose $K > 3$. Then $\mathbb{E}[F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)\mathbf{1}_{\|\mathcal{G}_N\|>K}] \leq \|(\Im w)^{-1}\|\mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathcal{G}_N\| > K\right)$ tends to zero when N goes to infinity by Bai-Yin's theorem [7]. Now,

$$\mathbb{E}[F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)\mathbf{1}_{\|\mathcal{G}_N\| \leq K}] = \int\int (I_n \otimes P_N)(w \otimes I_N - \beta_1 \otimes D'_N - \beta_2 \otimes U_N(x_1)\Delta_N(x_2)U_N^*(x_1))^{-1}$$
$$(I_n \otimes P_N^*)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(x_1)\mathbf{1}_{\|\Delta_N(x_2)\| \leq K}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(x_2),$$

where U_N is a $N \times N$ Haar unitary matrix and Δ_N is a real $N \times N$ diagonal matrix such that for almost every x_2, the empirical spectral measure $\mu_{\Delta_N(x_2)}$ converges weakly to the semicircular distribution. By Corollary 7.7 on unitary invariant models, for almost every x_2, $\int (I_n \otimes P_N)(w \otimes I_N - \beta_1 \otimes D'_N - \beta_2 \otimes U_N(x_1)\Delta_N(x_2)U_N^*(x_1))^{-1}(I_n \otimes P_N^*)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(x_1)\mathbf{1}_{\|\Delta_N(x_2)\| \leq K}$ converges to $((\omega(w) - s\beta_1) \otimes I_p)^{-1}$ when N goes to infinity. By dominated convergence, it readily follows that

$$\int\int (I_n \otimes P_N)(w \otimes I_N - \beta_1 \otimes D'_N - \beta_2 \otimes U_N(x_1)\Delta_N(x_2)U_N^*(x_1))^{-1}$$
$$\times\, (I_n \otimes P_N^*)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(x_1)\mathbf{1}_{\|\Delta_N(x_2)\| \leq K}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(x_2)$$

converges to $((\omega(w) - s\beta_1) \otimes I_p)^{-1}$. Thus, $\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)] = ((\omega(w) - s\beta_1) \otimes I_p)^{-1}$. □

9.3. **Approximation procedure.** Following [12, Section 2], for any $\epsilon > 0$, one can find $X_N(\epsilon) = [(X(\epsilon))_{ij}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq N}$ such that $X_N(\epsilon) = X_N(\epsilon)^*$ and

(H1) the variables $\sqrt{2}\Re X_{ij}(\epsilon)$, $\sqrt{2}\Im X_{ij}(\epsilon)$, $(i < j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, $X_{ii}(\epsilon)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, are independent, centered with variance 1 and satisfy a Poincaré inequality with common constant C_{PI},

(H2) for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{N}^2} \mathbb{E}\left(|X_{ij}(\epsilon)|^m\right) < +\infty, \tag{9.1}$$

and almost surely for large N,

$$\left\| \frac{X_N - X_N(\epsilon)}{\sqrt{N}} \right\| \leq \epsilon.$$

Set $F_N^\epsilon(w) = (I_n \otimes P_N V_N^*)\left(w \otimes I_N - \beta_1 \otimes A'_N - \beta_2 \otimes \frac{X_N(\epsilon)}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^{-1}(I_n \otimes V_N P_N^*)$. It readily follows that

$$\|F_N^\epsilon(w) - F_N(w)\| \leq \epsilon\|\beta_2\|\|(\Im w)^{-1}\|^2. \tag{9.2}$$

Note that assumptions (H1) and (H2) imply that, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\forall (i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2,\ \kappa_1^{i,j,\epsilon} = 0,\ \kappa_2^{i,j,\epsilon} = 1,$$
$$\forall (i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2,\ , i \neq j,\ \tilde{\kappa}_1^{i,j,\epsilon} = 0,\ \tilde{\kappa}_2^{i,j,\epsilon} = 1,$$

and for any $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\sup_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{N}^2} |\kappa_m^{i,j,\epsilon}| < +\infty, \quad \sup_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{N}^2} |\tilde{\kappa}_m^{i,j,\epsilon}| < +\infty, \tag{9.3}$$

where for $i \neq j$, $(\kappa_m^{i,j,\epsilon})_{m\geq 1}$ and $(\tilde{\kappa}_m^{i,j,\epsilon})_{m\geq 1}$ denote the classical cumulants of $\sqrt{2}\Re X_{ij}(\epsilon)$ and $\sqrt{2}\Im X_{ij}(\epsilon)$ respectively, and $(\kappa_m^{i,i,\epsilon})_{m\geq 1}$ denote the classical cumulants of $X_{ii}(\epsilon)$ (we set $(\tilde{\kappa}_m^{i,i,\epsilon})_{m\geq 1} \equiv 0$).

9.4. **Comparison with the Gaussian case.** For any matrix $M \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C})$, we denote by

$$M^{ij} = \left(\mathrm{Id}_{M_n(\mathbb{C})} \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_N\right)\left(M\left(I_n \otimes \hat{e}_{j,i}\right)\right) \in M_n(\mathbb{C}), \tag{9.4}$$

and

$$M_{ij} = \left(\mathrm{Tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})}\right)\left(M\left(e_{j,i} \otimes I_N\right)\right) \in M_N(\mathbb{C}),$$

where $e_{j,i}$ (resp. $\hat{e}_{j,i}$) denotes the $n \times n$ (resp. $N \times N$) matrix whose unique nonzero entry equals 1 and occurs in the row j and column i.

Proposition 9.2. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a standard G.U.E matrix. For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $w \in \mathbb{H}^+(M_m(\mathbb{C}))$, define*

$$\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w) = \left(w \otimes I_N - \beta_1 \otimes A'_N - \beta_2 \otimes \frac{X_N(\epsilon)}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^{-1}$$

and

$$\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{G}}(w) = \left(w \otimes I_N - \beta_1 \otimes A'_N - \beta_2 \otimes \frac{\mathcal{G}}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^{-1}.$$

There exists a polynomial P_ϵ with non negative coefficients such that for all large N, for any $v, u \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, for any $w \in \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$, for any deterministic $B_N^{(1)}, B_N^{(2)} \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\|B_N^{(1)}\| \leq 1$ and $\|B_N^{(2)}\| \leq 1$, we have

$$\left\|\mathbb{E}\left(B_N^{(1)}\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{G}}(w)B_N^{(2)}\right)^{vu} - \mathbb{E}\left(B_N^{(1)}\tilde{G}^{\epsilon}(w)B_N^{(2)}\right)^{vu}\right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} P_\epsilon(\left\|(\Im w)^{-1}\right\|), \tag{9.5}$$

and

$$\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[F_N^{\epsilon}(w)\right]\right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} P_\epsilon(\left\|(\Im w)^{-1}\right\|). \tag{9.6}$$

Proof. The first step on our proof is the following well-known lemma:

Lemma 9.3. *Let ξ be a real-valued random variable such that $\mathbb{E}(|\xi|^{p+2}) < \infty$. Let $\phi\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function whose first $p+1$ derivatives are continuous and bounded. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}(\xi\phi(\xi)) = \sum_{a=0}^{p} \frac{\kappa_{a+1}}{a!}\mathbb{E}(\phi^{(a)}(\xi)) + \epsilon, \tag{9.7}$$

where κ_a are the cumulants of ξ, $|\epsilon| \leq C \sup_t |\phi^{(p+1)}(t)|\mathbb{E}(|\xi|^{p+2})$, and C only depends on p.

We follow the approach of [37] (chapters 18 and 19) consisting in introducing an interpolation matrix $X_\epsilon(\alpha) = \cos\alpha X_N(\epsilon) + \sin\alpha\mathcal{G}$ for any $\alpha \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ and the

corresponding resolvent matrix $\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w) = \left(w \otimes I_N - \beta_1 \otimes A'_N - \beta_2 \otimes \frac{X_\epsilon(\alpha)}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^{-1}$ for any $w \in \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$. We have

$$B_N^{(1)} \left[\mathbb{E}\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{G}}(w) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w)\right] B_N^{(2)} = \int_0^{\pi/2} \mathbb{E}\left(B_N^{(1)} \frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w) B_N^{(2)}\right) \mathrm{d}\alpha,$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w) = \tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w)\beta_2 \otimes \left[\cos\alpha \frac{\mathcal{G}}{\sqrt{N}} - \sin\alpha \frac{X_N(\epsilon)}{\sqrt{N}}\right] \tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w).$$

Define the following basis of the real vector space of the selfadjoint matrices in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$:

$$\tilde{e}_{j,j} = \hat{e}_{j,j}, 1 \le j \le N,$$

$$\tilde{e}_{j,k} =: \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{e}_{j,k} + \hat{e}_{k,j}), 1 \le j < k \le N,$$

$$\tilde{f}_{j,k} =: \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{e}_{j,k} - \hat{e}_{k,j}), 1 \le j < k \le N.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N \left[-\sin\alpha X_{kk}(\epsilon) + \cos\alpha \mathcal{G}_{kk}\right] \tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w)\beta_2 \otimes \tilde{e}_{k,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{1\le j<k\le N} \left[-\sin\alpha\sqrt{2}\Re X_{jk}(\epsilon) + \cos\alpha\sqrt{2}\Re\mathcal{G}_{jk}\right] \tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w) \\
&\qquad\qquad \beta_2 \otimes \tilde{e}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{1\le j<k\le N} \left[-\sin\alpha\sqrt{2}\Im X_{jk}(\epsilon) + \cos\alpha\sqrt{2}\Im\mathcal{G}_{jk}\right] \tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w) \\
&\qquad\qquad \beta_2 \otimes \tilde{f}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, for any $1 \le k \le N$, $j < k$, applying Lemma 9.3 to each random variable ξ in the set $\left\{\sqrt{2}\Re X_{jk}(\epsilon), \sqrt{2}\Re\mathcal{G}_{jk}, \sqrt{2}\Im X_{jk}(\epsilon), \sqrt{2}\Im\mathcal{G}_{jk}, X_{kk}(\epsilon), \mathcal{G}_{kk}, j < k\right\}$ and to each ϕ in the set

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big\{\mathrm{Tr}\left[B_N^{(1)}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w)\beta_2 \otimes \tilde{e}_{k,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w)B_N^{(2)}e_{q,l} \otimes \hat{e}_{u,v}\right], \\
&\quad \mathrm{Tr}\left[B_N^{(1)}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w)\beta_2 \otimes \tilde{e}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w)B_N^{(2)}e_{q,l} \otimes \hat{e}_{u,v}\right], \\
&\quad \mathrm{Tr}\left[B_N^{(1)}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w)\beta_2 \otimes \tilde{f}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha, w)B_N^{(2)}e_{q,l} \otimes \hat{e}_{u,v}\right] : 1 \le u, v \le N, 1 \le q, l \le m\Big\},
\end{aligned}$$

with $p = 3$, and setting $B = B_N^{(2)}e_{q,l} \otimes \hat{e}_{u,v}B_N^{(1)}$, we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Tr}\left[\tfrac{\partial}{\partial s}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)B\right]\\
&= \frac{C(\alpha)}{N^{\frac{3}{2}}}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\kappa_3^{k,k,\epsilon}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{k,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{k,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\\
&\qquad\qquad\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{k,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)B\Big]\\
&\quad+\frac{C(\alpha)}{N^{\frac{3}{2}}}\sum_{1\le j<k<N}\kappa_3^{j,k,\epsilon}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\\
&\qquad\qquad\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)B\Big]\\
&\quad+\frac{C(\alpha)}{N^{\frac{3}{2}}}\sum_{1\le j<k<N}\tilde{\kappa}_3^{j,k,\epsilon}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{f}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{f}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\\
&\qquad\qquad\beta_2\otimes\tilde{f}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)B\Big]\\
&\quad+\frac{\tilde{C}(\alpha)}{N^2}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\kappa_4^{k,k,\epsilon}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{k,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{k,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\\
&\qquad\qquad\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{k,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)B\Big]\\
&\quad+\frac{\tilde{C}(\alpha)}{N^2}\sum_{1\le j<k<N}\kappa_4^{j,k,\epsilon}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\\
&\qquad\qquad\beta_2\otimes\tilde{e}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)B\Big]\\
&\quad+\frac{\tilde{C}(\alpha)}{N^2}\sum_{1\le j<k<N}\tilde{\kappa}_4^{j,k,\epsilon}\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{f}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\beta_2\otimes\tilde{f}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)\\
&\qquad\qquad\beta_2\otimes\tilde{f}_{j,k}\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)B\Big]\\
&\quad+\delta\\
&= I_1+I_2+I_3+I_4+I_5+I_6+\delta,
\end{aligned}
$$

with

$$|\delta|\le C_\epsilon\frac{\left\|(\Im w)^{-1}\right\|^6}{\sqrt{N}},$$

where $C(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{C}(\alpha)$ are some polynomials in $\cos\alpha$ and $\sin\alpha$, and C_ϵ is some nonnegative constant. In the following, C_ϵ is a nonnegative constant that may vary from line to line. It is clear that

$$|I_1|\le C_\epsilon\frac{\left\|(\Im w)^{-1}\right\|^4}{\sqrt{N}}\ \text{ and }\ |I_4|\le C_\epsilon\frac{\left\|(\Im w)^{-1}\right\|^5}{N}.$$

Let us denote for a while $\tilde{G}_\epsilon(\alpha,w)$ by G. Now, I_2 and I_3 are a finite linear combinations of terms of the form

$$\frac{C(\alpha)}{N^{\frac{3}{2}}}\sum_{j,k\in\mathcal{E}}C^{j,k,\epsilon}\mathrm{Tr}_n\left[\beta_2G^{p_1p_2}\beta_2G^{p_3p_4}\beta_2(GB_N^{(2)})^{p_5u}e_{q,l}(B_N^{(1)}G)^{vp_6}\right], \tag{9.8}$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is some subset of $\{1,\dots,N\}^2$, $C^{j,k,\epsilon}\in\{\kappa_3^{j,k,\epsilon},\tilde{\kappa}_3^{j,k,\epsilon}\}$, $\{p_1,\dots,p_6\}$ contains exactly three indices k and three j. The two following cases hold:

- If $p_5 = p_6 = j$ resp. k, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{j,k\in\mathcal{E}} C^{j,k,\epsilon} \mathrm{Tr}_n \left[\beta_2 G^{p_1 p_2} \beta_2 G^{p_3 p_4} \beta_2 (G B_N^{(2)})^{p_5 u} e_{q,l} (B_N^{(1)} G)^{v p_6} \right] \right\| \\
&\leq \quad C_\epsilon \left\| \beta_2 \right\|^3 \left\| (\Im w)^{-1} \right\|^2 N \sum_{j=1}^N \left\| (B_N^{(1)} G)^{vj} \right\| \left\| (G B_N^{(2)})^{ju} \right\| \\
&\leq \quad C_\epsilon \left\| \beta_2 \right\|^3 \left\| (\Im w)^{-1} \right\|^2 N \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N \left\| (B_N^{(1)} G)^{vj} \right\|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N \left\| (G B_N^{(2)})^{ju} \right\|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \quad C_\epsilon \left\| \beta_2 \right\|^3 \left\| (\Im w)^{-1} \right\|^4 nN.
\end{aligned}$$

  We use Lemma 10.1 in the last line.
- If $p_5 = j$ resp. k then $p_6 = k$ resp. j, then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{j,k\in\mathcal{E}} C^{j,k,\epsilon} \mathrm{Tr}_n \left[\beta_2 G^{p_1 p_2} \beta_2 G^{p_3 p_4} \beta_2 (G B_N^{(2)})^{p_5 u} e_{ql} (B_N^{(1)} G)^{v p_6} \right] \right\| \\
&\leq \quad C_\epsilon \left\| \beta_2 \right\|^3 \left\| (\Im w)^{-1} \right\|^2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \left\| (G B_N^{(2)})^{ku} \right\| \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \left\| (B_N^{(1)} G)^{vj} \right\| \right) \\
&\leq \quad C_\epsilon N \left\| \beta_2 \right\|^3 \left\| (\Im w)^{-1} \right\|^2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \left\| (G B_N^{(2)})^{ku} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \left\| (B_N^{(1)} G)^{vj} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \quad C_\epsilon nN \left\| \beta_2 \right\|^3 \left\| (\Im w)^{-1} \right\|^4,
\end{aligned}$$

  where we use Lemma 10.1 in the last line.

It readily follows that for $i = 2, 3$, there exists some contant $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$|I_i| \leq C_\epsilon \frac{\left\| (\Im w)^{-1} \right\|^4}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Finally, I_5 and I_6 are finite linear combinations of terms of the form

$$\frac{\tilde{C}(\alpha)}{N^2} \sum_{j,k\in\mathcal{E}} C^{j,k,\epsilon} \mathrm{Tr}_n \left[\beta_2 G^{p_1 p_2} \alpha G^{p_3 p_4} \beta_2 G^{p_5 p_6} \beta_2 (G B_N^{(2)})^{p_7 u} e_{q,l} (B_N^{(1)} G)^{v p_8} \right] \tag{9.9}$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is some subset of $\{1,\dots,N\}^2$, $C^{j,k,\epsilon} \in \{\kappa_4^{j,k,\epsilon}, \tilde{\kappa}_4^{j,k,\epsilon}\}$, $\{p_1,\dots,p_6\}$ contains exactly four k and four j. There exists some constant $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{j,k\in\mathcal{E}} C^{j,k,\epsilon} \mathrm{Tr}_n \left[\beta_2 G^{p_1p_2} \beta_2 G^{p_3p_4} \beta_2 G^{p_5p_6} \beta_2 (GB_N^{(2)})^{p_7 u} e_{q,l} (B_N^{(1)} G)^{vp_8} \right] \right\| \\
&\quad \leq C_\epsilon N \|\beta_2\|^4 \left\|(\Im w)^{-1}\right\|^4 \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \left\| (GB_N^{(2)})^{ku} \right\| \right) \\
&\quad \leq C_\epsilon N^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\beta_2\|^4 \left\|(\Im w)^{-1}\right\|^4 \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \left\| (GB_N^{(2)})^{ku} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad \leq C_\epsilon \sqrt{n} N^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\beta_2\|^4 \left\|(\Im w)^{-1}\right\|^5,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use Lemma 10.1 in the last line. It readily follows that for $i = 5, 6$, there exists some constant $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$|I_i| \leq C_\epsilon \frac{\left\|(\Im w)^{-1}\right\|^5}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Proposition 9.2 readily follows. □

9.5. **Concentration of $F_N^\epsilon(w) \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_p(\mathbb{C})$ for $w \in \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$.**

Proposition 9.4. *Let $w \in \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$. Then almost surely,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} F_N^\epsilon(w) - \mathbb{E}\left[F_N^\epsilon(w)\right] = 0. \tag{9.10}$$

Actually, we are going to prove the following more general result, similar to Proposition 7.2(1).

Proposition 9.5. *Let m be fixed in $\mathbb{N}$. Then for any orthogonal projectors p and q of rank at most m in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$, for any $w \in \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$, almost surely,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \|(I_n \otimes qV_N^*) \left[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w)]\right] (I_n \otimes V_N p)\| = 0. \tag{9.11}$$

Proof. Let $f_1,\dots,f_N$, respectively $f'_1,\dots,f'_N$, be an orthonormal basis adapted to the decomposition $\mathbb{C}^N = p\mathbb{C}^N \oplus [p\mathbb{C}^N]^\perp$, respectively $\mathbb{C}^N = q\mathbb{C}^N \oplus [q\mathbb{C}^N]^\perp$. Denote by $e_1,\dots,e_N$, the standard orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{C}^N$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|(I_n \otimes qV_N^*) \left[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w)]\right] (I_n \otimes V_N p)\right\| \\
&\quad = \sup_{\substack{x,y \in \mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^N \\ \|x\| \leq 1, \|y\| \leq 1}} |\langle (I_n \otimes qV_N^*) \left[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w)]\right] (I_n \otimes V_N p)x, y\rangle| \\
&\quad \leq m^2 n^2 \max_{\substack{i,i' \in \{1,\dots,n\}^2 \\ j,j' \in \{1,\dots m\}^2}} \left| \langle [\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w)]](e_i \otimes V_N f_j), e_{i'} \otimes V_N f'_{j'}) \rangle \right| \\
&\quad = m^2 n^2 \max_{\substack{i,i' \in \{1,\dots,n\}^2 \\ j,j' \in \{1,\dots m\}^2}} \left| \mathrm{Tr}\left\{ [\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w)]](e_i \otimes V_N f_j)(e_{i'} \otimes V_N f'_{j'})^* \right\} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we are going to study $\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w) - \mathbb{E}(\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w))\right) K\right]$ for any matrix $K = vu^*$ where u and v are vectors in $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^N$ such that $\|u\| \leq 1$ and $\|v\| \leq 1$.

For any Hermitian matrix Y_N define

$$\hat{G}_{Y_N}(w) = (w \otimes I_N - \beta_2 \otimes Y_N - \beta_1 \otimes A'_N)^{-1}.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{H}_N(\mathbb{C})$ the set of $N \times N$ Hermitian matrices. Define $f_N : Y_N \in \mathcal{H}_N(\mathbb{C}) \mapsto \mathrm{Tr}\left[\hat{G}_{Y_N}(w)K\right]$.

$$f_N(Z_N) - f_N(Y_N) = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{G}_{Z_N}(w)[\beta_2 \otimes (Y_N - Z_N)]\hat{G}_{Y_N}(w)K\right).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&|f_N(Z_N) - f_N(Y_N)| \\
&\leq \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left\{\beta_2^2 \otimes (Y_N - Z_N)^2\right\}\right)^{1/2} \\
&\qquad \times \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left\{\hat{G}_{Y_N}(w)K\hat{G}_{Z_N}(w)\hat{G}_{Z_N}(w)^*K^*\hat{G}_{Y_N}(w)^*\right\}\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\mathrm{Tr}\beta_2^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\mathrm{Tr}\left\{(Y_N - Z_N)^2\right\}\right)^{1/2}\|\hat{G}_{Z_N}(w)\hat{G}_{Z_N}(w)^*K^*\hat{G}_{Y_N}(w)^*\hat{G}_{Y_N}(w)\|^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\mathrm{Tr}\beta_2^2\right)^{1/2}\|(\Im w)^{-1}\|^2\left(\mathrm{Tr}\left\{(Z_N - Y_N)^2\right\}\right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the function f_N is Lipschitz.

Remark 9.6. If the law of a random variable X satisfies the Poincaré inequality with constant C_{PI} then, for any fixed $\alpha \neq 0$, the law of αX satisfies the Poincaré inequality with constant $\alpha^2 C_{PI}$. Moreover, assume that probability measures $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r$ on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfy the Poincaré inequality with constant $C_{PI}(1), \ldots, C_{PI}(r)$ respectively. Then the product measure $\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_r$ on $\mathbb{R}^r$ satisfies the Poincaré inequality with constant $C^*_{PI} = \max_{i \in \{1,\ldots,r\}} C_{PI}(i)$ in the sense that for any differentiable function f such that f and its gradient $\mathrm{grad}f$ are in $L^2(\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_r)$,

$$\mathbf{V}(f) \leq C^*_{PI} \int \|\mathrm{grad}f\|_2^2 d\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_r$$

with $\mathbf{V}(f) = \int |f - \int f \, \mathrm{d}\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_r|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_r$ (see [27, Theorem 2.5]) .

An important consequence of the Poincaré inequality is the following concentration result.

Lemma 9.7 ([3, Lemma 4.4.3 and Exercise 4.4.5] or [31, Chapter 3])**.** *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^r$ which satisfies a Poincaré inequality with constant C_{PI}. Then there exists $K_1 > 0$ and $K_2 > 0$ such that, for any Lipschitz function F on $\mathbb{R}^r$ with Lipschitz constant $|F|_{Lip}$,*

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \, \mathbb{P}\left(|F - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(F)| > \epsilon\right) \leq K_1 \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon}{K_2\sqrt{C_{PI}}|F|_{Lip}}\right).$$

Hence, Remark 9.6, Lemma 9.7 and (H1) yield the inequality

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w) - \mathbb{E}(\tilde{G}_\epsilon(w))\right)K\right]\right| > \varepsilon\right) \leq 2\exp\left(-CN^{1/2}\|(\Im w)^{-1}\|^{-2}\varepsilon\right).$$

Then (9.11) follows by an application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma. □

9.6. **Conclusion.** Now, writing

$$\begin{aligned} & F_N(w) - ((\omega(w) - s\beta_1) \otimes I_p)^{-1} \\ = \;& F_N(w) - F_N^\epsilon(w) + F_N^\epsilon(w) - \mathbb{E}[F_N^\epsilon(w)] + \mathbb{E}[F_N^\epsilon(w)] - \mathbb{E}[F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)] + \mathbb{E}[F_N^{\mathcal{G}}(w)] \\ & - ((\omega(w) - s\beta_1) \otimes I_p)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

letting N go to infinity and then ϵ tend to zero, (9.2), (9.10) Proposition 9.2 and Proposition 9.1 yield

Theorem 9.8. *For any $w \in \mathbb{H}^+(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$, almost surely, when N goes to infinity, $F_N(w)$ converges towards $((\omega(w) - s\beta_1) \otimes I_p)^{-1}$.*

Note that ω extends as an analytic map $z \mapsto \omega(ze_{1,1} - \beta_0)$ to all of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(P(a,x))$ (the proof is a simplified version of the proof of Lemma 4.5).

Let t be in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(P(a,x))$. Define $\Psi(w) = w \otimes 1 - \beta_1 \otimes a - \beta_2 \otimes x$. Set $w_0 = te_{1,1} - \beta_0$. According to Lemma 4.3, $\Psi(w_0)$ is invertible and thus there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$d(0, \sigma(\Psi(w_0))) \geq \delta > 0. \tag{9.12}$$

According to Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.2, almost surely for any k, for any polynomial $\tilde{P}$ in two noncommutative indeterminates with coefficients in $M_k(\mathbb{C})$,

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \left\| \tilde{P}\left(A'_N, \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}\right) \right\| = \|\tilde{P}(a,x)\|.$$

Define $\Psi_N(w) = w \otimes I_N - \beta_1 \otimes A'_N - \beta_2 \otimes \frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}$. In particular, almost surely for any polynomial $\hat{P} \in \mathbb{C}[X]$, we have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \|\hat{P}(\Psi_N(w_0))\| = \|\hat{P}(\Psi(w_0))\|.$$

By asymptotic freeness we also have that almost surely for any polynomial $\hat{P} \in \mathbb{C}[X]$,

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} (\mathrm{tr}_n \otimes \mathrm{tr}_N)(\hat{P}(\Psi_N(w_0))) = (\mathrm{tr}_n \otimes \tau)(\hat{P}(\Psi(w_0))).$$

Thus, we deduce that almost surely for N large enough,

$$d_H(\sigma(\Psi_N(w_0)), \sigma(\Psi(w_0))) \leq \delta/4.$$

Now, for any $w \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$, since $\Psi_N(w_0)$ is selfadjoint, the elements of $\sigma(\Psi_N(w))$ stay at a distance from $\sigma(\Psi_N(w_0))$ which is lower than $\|w - w_0\|$. Then, using (9.12), it readily follows that almost surely for all large N, for any w such that $\|w - w_0\| < \delta/4$,

$$d(0, \sigma(\Psi_N(w))) \geq \delta/2.$$

Moreover, denoting by $s_1(M)$ the smallest singular value of any matrix M, we have

$$s_1(\Psi_N(w)) \geq s_1(\Psi_N(w_0)) - \|w - w_0\|,$$

so that almost surely for all large N, for any w such that $\|w - w_0\| < \delta/4$,

$$\|(\Psi_N(w))^{-1}\| \leq 4/\delta.$$

Therefore almost surely for large N, $(F_N)_N$ is a normal family of holomorphic maps on $\{w \in M_n(\mathbb{C}), \|w - (te_{1,1} - \beta_0)\| < \delta/4\}$. Set

$$\Lambda = \{w \in M_n(\mathbb{C}), \|w - (te_{1,1} - \beta_0)\| < \delta/4, \; \Im w > 0\}.$$

Almost surely for any $w \in \Lambda$ such that $\Im w \in M_n(\mathbb{Q})$ and $\Re w \in M_n(\mathbb{Q})$, $F_N(w)$ converges towards $(\omega(w) - s\beta_1)^{-1} \otimes I_p$. By Vitali's theorem, it follows that almost

surely F_N converges towards a holomorphic function on $\{w \in M_n(\mathbb{C}), \|w-(te_{1,1}-\beta_0)\| < \delta/4\}$, and, in particular, $F_N(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)$ converges for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z-t| < \delta/4$. Let us prove that the limiting object is $(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p$. Almost surely for large N, for any $q \in \mathbb{Q}\setminus\{0\}$, $0 < 1/q < \delta/8$ and any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z-t| < \delta/8$, setting $\epsilon_z = 1$ if $\Im z \geq 0$ and $\epsilon_z = -1$ if $\Im z < 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&F_N(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0) - (\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p \\
&\quad = \quad (I_n \otimes P_N V_N^*)\{\Psi_N(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\}^{-1}[i\frac{\epsilon_z}{q} I_n \otimes I_N] \\
&\qquad\qquad \times\{\Psi_N(ze_{1,1}+i\frac{\epsilon_z}{q}I_n-\beta_0)\}^{-1}(I_n\otimes V_N P_N^*) \\
&\qquad + F_N(ze_{1,1}+i\frac{\epsilon_z}{q}I_n-\beta_0) - (\omega(ze_{1,1}+i\frac{\epsilon_z}{q}I_n-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p \\
&\qquad + (\omega(ze_{1,1}+i\frac{\epsilon_z}{q}I_n-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p - (\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|F_N(ze_{1,1}-\beta) - (\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p\| \\
&\quad \leq \quad 16\frac{1}{q\delta^2} \\
&\qquad + \|F_N(ze_{1,1}+i\frac{\epsilon_z}{q}I_n-\beta_0) - (\omega(ze_{1,1}+i\frac{\epsilon_z}{q}I_n-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p\| \\
&\qquad + \|(\omega(ze_{1,1}+i\frac{\epsilon_z}{q}I_n-\beta_0)-\alpha a)^{-1}\otimes I_p - (\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p\|.
\end{aligned}$$

We deduce by letting N go to infinity and then q go to infinity that almost surely, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z-t| < \delta/8$, $F_N(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)$ converges to $(w_1(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p$ when N goes to infinity. We conclude by Hurwitz's theorem that for ϵ small enough, almost surely for large N, the number of zeros of

$$z \mapsto \det\Big[I_n\otimes I_p - (\beta_1\otimes\Theta)(I_n\otimes P_N)\left((ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes I_N - \alpha\otimes A_N' - \beta\otimes\frac{X_N}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^{-1}(I_n\otimes P_N^*)\Big]$$

and the number of zeros of $z\mapsto\det[I_n\otimes I_p-(\beta_1\otimes\Theta)(\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p]$ in $\{z\in\mathbb{C}\colon |z-t|<\epsilon\}$ are equal. Now, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta_1((\omega(ze_{11}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes\Theta - I_n\otimes I_p \\
&\quad = \quad (\beta_1\otimes\mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1,\dots,\theta_p) - s\beta_1\otimes I_p)\,(\omega(ze_{11}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p - I_n\otimes I_p \\
&\quad = \quad (\beta_1\otimes\mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1,\dots,\theta_p) - \omega(ze_{11}-\beta_0)\otimes I_p)\,(\omega(ze_{11}-\beta_0)-s\beta_1)^{-1}\otimes I_p
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\omega(ze_{1,1}-\beta_0)\otimes I_p - \beta_1\otimes\mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1,\dots,\theta_p) = \sum_{i=1}^p(\omega(ze_{11}-\beta_0)-\beta_1\theta_i)\otimes e_{i,i},$$

so that

$$\det(\omega(ze_{11}-\beta_0)\otimes I_p - \beta_1\otimes\mathrm{Diag}(\theta_1,\dots,\theta_p)) = \prod_{i=1}^p\det(\omega(ze_{11}-\beta_0)-\beta_1\theta_i).$$

Theorem 5.3 follows. □

10. Appendix

Lemma 10.1. *For any matrix $M \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C})$,*

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k,l=1}^{N} ||M^{kl}||^2 \leq n||M||^2 \tag{10.1}$$

and for any fixed k,

$$\sum_{l=1}^{N} ||M^{lk}||^2 \leq n||M||^2 \tag{10.2}$$

and

$$\sum_{l=1}^{N} ||M^{kl}||^2 \leq n||M||^2, \tag{10.3}$$

where M^{kl} is defined by (9.4).

See [12, Lemma 8.1] for a proof.

References

[1] Lars V. Ahlfors. *An Introduction to the Theory of Analytic Functions of One Complex Variable.* Third Edition (1979) McGraw-Hill, Inc. New York.

[2] Naum Ilich Akhieser, *The classical moment problem and some related questions in analysis.* Translated by N. Kemmer. Hafner Publishing Co., New York, 1965.

[3] G. W. Anderson, A. Guionnet, and O. Zeitouni, *An introduction to random matrices*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.

[4] G. W. Anderson, *Convergence of the largest singular value of a polynomial in independent Wigner matrices.* Ann. Probab. **41** (2013), 2103–2181.

[5] M. Anshelevich, S. T. Belinschi, M. Février, and A. Nica, *Convolution powers in the operator-valued context.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **365**, No.4, 2063–2097 (2013).

[6] Z. D. Bai and J. Yao, *On sample eigenvalues in a generalized spiked population model*, J. Multivariate Anal. **106** (2012), 167–177.

[7] Z. D. Bai and Y. Q. Yin, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for almost sure convergence of the largest eigenvalue of a Wigner matrix.* Ann. Probab., 16(4), (1988), 1729–1741.

[8] J. Baik, G. Ben Arous, and S. Péché, *Phase transition of the largest eigenvalue for nonnull complex sample covariance matrices*, Ann. Probab. **33** (2005), 1643–1697.

[9] J. Baik and J. W. Silverstein, *Eigenvalues of large sample covariance matrices of spiked population models*, J. Multivariate Anal. **97**(2006), 1382–1408.

[10] S. T. Belinschi, M. Popa, and V. Vinnikov, *Infinite divisibility and a non-commutative Boolean-to-free Bercovici-Pata bijection*, Journal of Functional Analysis, **262**, 2012, Issue 1, 94–123.

[11] S. T. Belinschi, H. Bercovici, M. Capitaine and M. Février, *Outliers in the spectrum of large deformed unitarily invariant models.* Ann. Probab., to appear.

[12] S. T. Belinschi and M. Capitaine, *Spectral properties of polynomials in independent Wigner and deterministic matrices.* Preprint arXiv:1611.07440v1 [math.PR] (2016).

[13] S. T. Belinschi, T. Mai and R. Speicher, *Analytic subordination theory of operator-valued free additive convolution and the solution of a general random matrix problem.* Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik, 2015.

[14] F. Benaych-Georges and R. R. Nadakuditi, *The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of finite, low rank perturbations of large random matrices.* Advances in Mathematics 227 (2011), 494–521.

[15] H. Bercovici and D. Voiculescu, *Regularity questions for free convolution.* Nonselfadjoint operator algebras, operator theory, and related topics, 37–47, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. 104, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1998.

[16] B. Blackadar, Operator Algebras. Theory of C^*-Algebras and von Neumann Algebras. Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, Volume 122. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2006.

[17] M. Capitaine, *Additive/multiplicative free subordination property and limiting eigenvectors of spiked additive deformations of Wigner matrices and spiked sample covariance matrices,* Journal of Theoretical Probability, Volume 26 (3) (2013), 595–648.

[18] M. Capitaine, *Exact separation phenomenon for the eigenvalues of large Information-Plus-Noise type matrices. Application to spiked models,* Indiana Univ. Math. J. **63** (2014), 1875–1910.

[19] M. Capitaine and C. Donati-Martin. *Strong asymptotic freeness for Wigner and Wishart matrices.* Indiana Univ. Math. J., **56** (2):767-803, 2007.

[20] M. Capitaine, C. Donati-Martin, and D. Féral, *The largest eigenvalues of finite rank deformation of large Wigner matrices: convergence and nonuniversality of the fluctuations*, Ann. Probab. **37** (2009), 1–47.

[21] M. Capitaine, C. Donati-Martin, D. Féral and M. Février. *Free convolution with a semicircular distribution and eigenvalues of spiked deformations of Wigner matrices.* Electronic Journal of Probability 16 (2011), 1750–1792.

[22] B. Collins and C. Male, *The strong asymptotic freeness of Haar and deterministic matrices*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **47** (2014), no. 1, 147–163.

[23] B. Collins, T. Hasebe and N. Sakuma, *Free probability for purely discrete eigenvalues of random matrices*. Preprint arXiv1512.08975.

[24] K.J. Dykema, *On certain free product factors via an extended matrix model.* J. Funct. Anal. **112** (1993), 31–60.

[25] D. Féral and S. Péché, *The largest eigenvalue of rank one deformation of large Wigner matrices*, Comm. Math. Phys. **272** (2007), 185–228.

[26] Z. Fűredi and J. Komlós, *The eigenvalues of random symmetric matrices*, Combinatorica **1** (1981), 233–241.

[27] A. Guionnet and B. Zegarlinski. Lectures on Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities. In *Séminaire de Probabilités, XXXVI*, volume 1801 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*. Springer, Berlin, 2003.

[28] U. Haagerup and S. Thorbjørnsen, *A new application of random matrices:* $\mathrm{Ext}(\mathrm{C}^*_{\mathrm{red}}(F_2))$ *is not a group*, Ann. of Math. (2) **162** (2005), no. 2, 711–775.

[29] W. Helton, R. Rashidi-Far and R. Speicher, *Operator-valued Semicircular Elements: Solving A Quadratic Matrix Equation with Positivity Constraints*. Int. Math. Res. Not. 2007, No. 22, Article ID rnm086, (2007)

[30] I. Johnstone, *On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis*, Ann. Stat. **29** (2001), 295–327.

[31] M. Ledoux. The Concentration of Measure Phenomenon, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Volume 89, A.M.S, 2001.

[32] P. Loubaton and P. Vallet, *Almost sure localization of the eigenvalues in a Gaussian information-plus-noise model. Application to the spiked models*, Electron. J. Probab. **16** (2011), no. 70, 1934–1959.

[33] T. Mai, PhD thesis, Universität des Saarlandes, 2014.

[34] M. Maida, *Large deviations for the largest eigenvalue of rank one deformations of Gaussian ensembles,* Elec. J. Probab. Vol. **12** (2007) 1131–1150.

[35] C. Male, *The norm of polynomials in large random and deterministic matrices.* With an appendix by Dimitri Shlyakhtenko. Probab. Theory Related Fields **154**, no. 3-4, 477-532 (2012).

[36] A. Nica, D. Shlyakhtenko, and R. Speicher, *Operator-Valued Distributions. I. Characterizations of Freeness.* International Mathematics Research Notices 2002, **29**, 1509–1538.

[37] L. Pastur and Mariya Shcherbina, *Eigenvalue distribution of Large Random Matrices* Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 171. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011.

[38] S. Péché, *The largest eigenvalue of small rank perturbations of Hermitian random matrices*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **134** (2006), 127–173.

[39] A. Pizzo, D. Renfrew, and A. Soshnikov, *On finite rank deformations of Wigner matrices*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat., **49**, (2013), no. 1, 6494..

[40] N. R. Rao and J. W. Silverstein, *Fundamental limit of sample generalized eigenvalue based detection of signals in noise using relatively few signal-bearing and noise-only samples*, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing **4** (2010), 468–480.

[41] R. Remmert, *Funktionentheorie. I*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
[42] M. P. Schützenberger, *On the definition of a family of automata*, Inform.Control **4** (1961), 245–270.
[43] D. Shlyakhtenko, *Random Gaussian band matrices and freeness with amalgamation*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (1996), no. 20, 1013–1025. MR 1422374 (97j:46070)
[44] D. Shlyakhtenko, *A-valued semicircular systems*, J. Funct. Anal. **166** (1999), no. 1, 1–47. MR MR1704661 (2000j:46124).
[45] D. Shlyakhtenko, *Free probability of type B and asymptotics of finite rank perturbations of random matrices.* Preprint, arXiv:1509.08841.
[46] Masamichi Takesaki, *Theory of Operator Algebras* I. Springer-Verlag New York Inc., 1979
[47] D. Voiculescu, *Addition of certain non-commutative random variables.* J. Funct. Anal., 66 (1986), 323–346.
[48] D. Voiculescu, *Multiplication of certain noncommuting random variables*, J. Operator Theory **18**(1987), 223–235.
[49] D. Voiculescu, *Limit laws for random matrices and free products.* Invent. Math.,**104** (1991), 201–220.
[50] D. Voiculescu, *The analogues of entropy and of Fisher's information measure in free probability theory. I*, Comm. Math. Phys. **155** (1993), 411–440.
[51] D. Voiculescu, *Operations on certain non-commutative operator-valued random variables*, Astérisque (1995), no. 232, 243–275, Recent advances in operator algebras (Orléans, 1992). MR 1372537 (97b:46081)
[52] D. Voiculescu, *The coalgebra of the free difference quotient and free probability*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (2000), no. 2, 79–106. MR MR1744647 (2001d:46096)
[53] D. Voiculescu, *Analytic subordination consequences of free Markovianity*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **51** (2002), 1161–1166.
[54] D. Voiculescu, K. Dykema and A. Nica, *Free random variables.* CRM Monograph Series, Vol. 1, AMS, 1992.

CNRS - Institut de Matheématiques de Toulouse, 118 Route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse, FRANCE
E-mail address: serban.belinschi@math.univ-toulouse.fr

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405 U.S.A.
E-mail address: bercovic@indiana.edu

CNRS - Institut de Matheématiques de Toulouse, 118 Route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse, FRANCE
E-mail address: mireille.capitaine@math.univ-toulouse.fr